

283074

JPRS-UWE-85-010

27 August 1985

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 6, June 1985

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

19991008 003

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

2
94
A05

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

27 August 1985

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 6, June 1985

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal **MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA** published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| English Summary of Major Articles (pp 158-159)..... | 1 |
| Recent Soviet Disarmament Initiatives, U.S. Responses Viewed (pp 3-17) (V. Petrovskiy)..... | 4 |
| Soviet Scientific Peace Council on SDI, Delhi Declaration (pp 18-20)..... | 21 |
| Peace Movement Flourishing Despite Repression, Splitting Tactics (pp 21-32) (Ye. Silin)..... | 25 |
| Thirtieth Anniversary of the Bandung Conference (pp 33-47) (Yu. Alimov) (not translated) | |
| Economic Development, U.S. Military Policy in Pacific Viewed (pp 48-58) (Yu. Stolyarov, A. Shmyrev)..... | 36 |
| Formation of an Industrial-Information Complex in the Capitalist Countries (pp 59-67) (L. Gromov, Ye. Chetyrkin) (not translated) | |
| CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS THEORIES | |
| The Law of Value Operates (pp 68-83) (K. Val'tukh) (not translated) | |

OUR CORRESPONDENT ABROAD

The Problem of the FRG's 'Technological Backwardness' (pp 84-91)
(Yu. Yudanov) (not translated)

DOMESTIC POLITICAL LIFE ABROAD

The Ecology Movement in West Europe (p 92) (not translated)

Organizations of Defenders of the Environment in Great Britain (pp 93-98)
(I. Gorodetskaya) (not translated)

The Ecologists' Movement in France (pp 99-102)
(V. Skorokhodov) (not translated)

The Ecology Movement in Italy (pp 103-107)
(I. Semenenko) (not translated)

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

Austrian Neutrality, Trade With USSR Discussed (pp 108-114)
(M. Yasovskaya)..... 45

Technology Transfer in World Trade Discussed (pp 115-125)
(A. Bykov)..... 53

MEMO ATLAS

Greenland Raises its Political Voice (pp 126-130)
(Yu. Baturin) (not translated)

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

IMEMO Session in Remembrance of V.L. Tyagunenko (pp 131-132) (not translated)

BOOKS, AUTHORS

Primakov Book on Camp David Accords Reviewed (pp 133-135)
(V. Avakov)..... 71

P. Khvoynik Review of "The Undermining of Age-Old Foundations
(Contradictions of Capitalism's World Economic System)" (pp 135-137)
(V.V. Rymalov) (not translated)

Swiss-Hungarian Book on East-West Relations Reviewed (pp 137-139)
(A. Kireyev)..... 75

U.S. Anthology on Euromissiles Controversy Reviewed (pp 139-140)
(V. Valentinov)..... 79

Review of "L'URSS et le Tiers-Monde: une strategie oblique" from
Les Cahiers de la Fondation pour les etudes de defense nationale
(pp 141-142) (not translated)

| | |
|--|----|
| Book on U.S., West European Arms Exports Reviewed (pp 143-144) | |
| (A. Portnyagin)..... | 82 |
| Institute Book on Third World Socioeconomic Problems Reviewed (pp 144-146) | |
| (I. Aleshina)..... | 85 |
| I. Vasil'yeva Review of "The Leisure Industry in the United States" (pp 146-147) | |
| (O.V. Terekhova) (not translated) | |

STATISTICS

| | |
|--|--|
| Certain International Trade Trends (pp 148-157) (not translated) | |
|--|--|

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS No 6, June 1985

Russian title : MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE
OTNOSHENIYA

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : Ya.S. Khavinson

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda"

Place of publication : Moscow

Date of publication : June 1985

Signed to press : 12 May 1985

Copies : 27,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda".
"Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye
otnosheniya", 1985

ENGLISH SUMMARY OF MAJOR ARTICLES

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 158-159

[Text] The Soviet Union believes that the war can be averted but the struggle for safeguarding peace and security is not an easy matter, it requires increased efforts. V. Petrovskiy in the article "The Main Road towards the World Security" points out that the prevention of nuclear war poses the urgent question of building a reliable system of security capable of meeting the realities of the nuclear-missile age. Many routes lead toward a safe world but the principal of them is arms limitation and disarmament "Safety through disarmament"--that is how the First Special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament held in June 1978 determined the main direction of the efforts of all states. The article notes that the only reasonable way out of the existing situation is agreement between the confronting forces on an immediate termination of the arms race, above all the nuclear race on earth and its prevention in space. The article points out the necessity of a complex approach to the issues of space and nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union proposed a concrete program of measures for freezing nuclear armaments on a global level which includes a complex of effective reciprocal steps. A complete elimination of nuclear weapons is determined by the Soviet Union as the principal goal of the stage by stage program of nuclear disarmament. The author emphasizes that political realism of the nuclear space age requires a gradual solution of the tasks of arms limitation and disarmament which is the main link in a chain of measures, leading to guaranteed world security. At the same time this link is inseparable from the provision of security in all other directions. Arms limitation and disarmament is a field for broad cooperation of states with different socio-economic and political systems as these issues touch upon a problem, common for all states and peoples--that of preventing a nuclear holocaust. The Soviet Union stands for equal, correct interstate relations, based on a genuine respect of international legal norms. But international relations can be directed into a course of normal cooperation only if imperialism abandons its attempts to solve a historical argument between two social systems by military means.

In the early eighties the peace movement particularly in Europe acquired an unprecedented scale. Ye. Silin in the article "Anti-War Movement Today" by citing rich factual data and quoting foreign scientists shows that the anti-war movement in Europe has withstood all tests and once again encourages the broad masses to struggle for a halt in the arms race on Earth and its prevention in outer space. The deployment of American nuclear missiles in certain European

NATO countries has brought to the attention of the movement a number of serious questions and disclosed its strong and weak sides but has not counter to the expectations of its opponents led to its subsiding. Just on the contrary, now the peace movement has become a factor which is continually exerting pressure on the political spheres of the capitalist countries. They are forced to take into consideration this new factor while mapping out new concepts and making foreign-policy decisions on security and defense problems. The ruling circles of the West, the U.S.A. in particular are trying to reduce the movement to zero, using all methods from court and police reprisals to attempts to demoralize it, distract it from the only true path. The consistent peace-loving foreign policy of the USSR and the countries of the socialist-community is a reliable support for the peace movement throughout the world. The new Soviet foreign political initiatives are meeting understanding in the ranks of the anti-war movement, imparting to it additional impulses in the struggle for peace and disarmament.

Yu. Alimov in the article "Connection Between Time and Events (The Thirtieth Anniversary of Bandung Conference)" pays attention to the historical inter-connection of some anniversaries being marked in 1985--such as the fortieth anniversary of the end of the second world war and the thirtieth anniversary of the Bandung conference of countries of Asia and Africa. The author draws attention that the peaceableness of the Bandung countries was based on their hard experience of participation in the war and their post-war striving for cooperation on the general basic world interests. The pre-history of Bandung initiates from the Asian Solidarity Conference of 1947 and 1949 in Delhi and is revealed as a collision of two foreign policy courses: that of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence laid down by India and its leader Jawaharlal Nehru and of the imperialist course of blocs and "cold war". The Bandung conference, its work and compromise agreements are presented as an attempt to prevent a split, to shape peaceful coexistence and cooperation among the non-aligned and "bloc" countries, the participants of the conference. The article examines the development of these countries in the post-Bandung period, refers to the peculiarities of the parallel development of Afro-Asian solidarity and the movement of non-alignment. It reveals the international importance of Bandung, the viability of its spirit in relations between different countries. The author comes to the conclusion that despite a cooling of the international climate the possibility and necessity of strengthening the Bandung spirit still exist. The author focuses his attention on the role of the Soviet Union and other socialist states, continuing to support Bandung and its principles. The Soviet Union has always supported the struggle of peoples for liberation from colonial oppression. Its sympathies always go out to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America which are following the road of consolidating independence and social renovation. For the Soviet Union they are friends and partners in the struggle for durable peace, for better and just relations between nations.

The article by Yu. Stolyarov and A. Shmyrev "The Pacific Ocean in Strategy of Imperialism" examines the great changes in the economic and military-political situation of the region which has enhanced its role in the world of today. The article notes that the share of the Pacific region in the capitalist countries' industrial production in the early eighties reached 55 percent and

in exports 35 percent. The article points out that the accelerated development of the countries and territories of the region can be explained by the changes in the sphere of material production as the scientific and technical revolution develops. This development having assumed an interconnected and supplementary nature enables us to characterize the economic process in the Pacific Ocean area as economic interdependence. The article considers the general and specific features of this process which contribute to the general character of the economic integration of the capitalist world. In the second half of the 1970's the U.S.A. in close cooperation with Japan sharply stepped up its efforts to build a new military-political structure of imperialism in the region. The U.S.A. creates now a new eastern front of struggle against the USSR and forces of socialism in the Pacific Ocean area. The article shows how the U.S.A. is doubling its military preparations in the Pacific, and how Japan is enhancing its militarization. As a result a Washington-Tokyo-Seoul axis has increased its activity. The article shows in detail the development of the so-called Pacific Community conception and examines the policy, aims and activities of its would-be members. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned it has time and again exposed such anti-communist blocs as ASPAC and CEATO, various militarist, axes and triangles of the Washington-Tokyo-Seoul type. The USSR resolutely opposes all kinds of "spheres of influence" and "zones of interests", in the Pacific as it belongs to all countries of the world and must and should become an Ocean of peace and good-neighborliness.

The aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the acceleration of its global and local instability, the contradictory evolution of socio-political situation within the non-socialist part of the world, drastic fluctuations of conjuncture have translated information into a significant factor, providing for the short-term gains and long-run advantages. Information appears to be of even more value with the accelerated pace of scientific and technical advance which has created material basis for the satisfaction of the growing demand for information. Given the rise and constant differentiation of the demand for information L. Gromov and Ye. Chetyrkin in the article "Formation of Industrial Information Complex of Capitalism" explore also the supply side, marking the increase of its volume and observing the growth of the number of possible producers of information. The emphasis is also placed on the investigation of pathways and pitfalls typical of the bourgeois state attempts to achieve the balance between information supply and demand in order to ensure the sustained growth of capitalist production. The authors dispel a number of misconceptions about the so-called "information industry" being in vogue in Western literature and suggest a new term namely "industrial information complex". According to them the new term positively reflects the actual industrialization of the information activity on the basis of vast computerization, wide spread of microprocessors. After the outlining the basic features of the contemporary industrial information complex the authors assess the main results of its formation and functioning within the capitalist framework. Though the electronification of information is a supplementary input to the rise of capitalist productivity and overall efficiency of economy, the spread of built-in microprocessors, robotization pose special threat to future employment prospects, jeopardizing the vital interests of the working class. The involved displacement of workers would contribute to the social tension in the advanced capitalist countries.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

RECENT SOVIET DISARMAMENT INITIATIVES, U.S. RESPONSES REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 3-17

[Article by V. Petrovskiy: "The Highway to a Secure World"]

[Text] It was emphasized with new force at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum that our foreign policy program is plain and clear: we are convinced that a world war can be prevented. But, as experience shows, the struggle to preserve peace and ensure general security is no easy matter. It requires increasingly new efforts.

The USSR is prepared for negotiations with all who are honest in their intentions, who wish to come to an agreement, respecting the interests of the partner and international law, and who express the will to overcome tension and develop peaceful cooperation. These are the most important principles of our international policy with which the Soviet people are proceeding today toward the 27th party congress.

The task of preventing a new world war poses with all seriousness the question of the creation of a dependable security system corresponding to the realities of the nuclear age. Many routes lead to a secure world, but the main one is arms limitation and disarmament. "Security through disarmament"--this was how the UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session, which was held in June 1978, defined the arterial direction of states' efforts.

The significance of the problem of curbing the arms race and of disarmament is not confined to the fact that disarmament is intended to be a most important means of eliminating the material-technical basis of war. This process would be reflected in a salutary manner in the general political climate in the world, seriously underpin political, international-law and moral-psychological security guarantees and activate the corresponding negotiating mechanisms.

Under conditions where such a terrible threat as that of our day looms over mankind the sole reasonable way out of the situation is an agreement by the confrontational forces on an immediate halt to the race in arms--primarily nuclear--on Earth and the prevention thereof in space. Agreement on an honest and equal basis, without attempts to "outdo" the other side and dictate one's terms to it. An agreement which could help all to progress toward the desired

goal--the complete extermination and prohibition for all time of nuclear weapons and the complete removal of the threat of nuclear war. The appropriate material basis for this exists--the military-strategic balance of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. This parity, M.S. Gorbachev points out, must be preserved in every way possible.

I

Key significance in preventing and removing the nuclear danger is attached to preventing the militarization of space. The emergence of the arms race in space would inevitably be a catalyst for an arms race in other areas also. As a result everything that it has been possible to achieve earlier in curbing the arms race would be devalued.

Space should be an arena of fruitful cooperation and not military confrontation. This is how the Soviet Union and the other socialist states put this issue. This is how it is understood by all to whom the interests of peace are dear. An impressive demonstration of the aspiration of the world's peace-loving forces to prevent the militarization of space were the results of the voting at the UN General Assembly 39th Session on a resolution calling for space to be excluded from the sphere of the arms race. Some 150 states voted in favor of the resolution, which reflects the essence of the Soviet proposals submitted for examination by the Assembly, and only the United States abstained. For the first time a UN document formulated the proposition that all states refrain in their space activity from the use of force. It is proposed that agreements be reached immediately on preventing an arms race in space.

Abiding by its high-minded policy course, the Soviet Union is consistently seeking to ensure that renunciation of the spread of the arms race to space become the norm of states' behavior in the nuclear-space era. The task of preventing the militarization of space demands a complete ban on space strike systems. It is a question of the fact that strike weapons of any kind--conventional, nuclear, laser, beam or any other--whether on manned or unmanned systems, must not be put into space and deployed there. Space weapons of all kinds of basing cannot be created, tested or deployed for ABM defense, as antisatellite weapons or for use against targets on Earth or in the air. Such weapons as have already been created have to be destroyed. Nor is there any doubt that an agreement on the banning and liquidation in toto of the class of strike space weapons lends itself entirely to reliable and effective control.

The Soviet Union's approach is aimed at a one-time solution of the guaranteed prevention of the militarization of space and the ensuring on this basis of the possibility of its peaceful conquest and use.

The new negotiations between the USSR and the United States on a set of questions concerning space and nuclear arms (both strategic and intermediate-range), which were proposed by the Soviet Union and which began on 12 March 1985 in Geneva, are intended to contribute to real progress in lessening the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war and halting the arms race and improving the international situation.

It is significant that the United States' attempts to circumvent the problem of space, prevent discussion of the question of its nonmilitarization and confine itself merely to the types of arms on which negotiations have already been conducted earlier (that is, strategic arms and intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe) were unsuccessful. The American side ultimately came to accept the viewpoint according to which questions of space and nuclear arms are indivisible and should be discussed and tackled compositely. The Soviet Union firmly insisted on this, and this is the fundamental novelty of the Soviet-American Geneva negotiations. The two sides' agreement that the purpose of the negotiations is the formulation of effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space and a halt thereto on Earth and at limiting and reducing nuclear arms is important also.

The idea of the comprehensive approach to problems of the nonmilitarization of space and nuclear disarmament belongs to the Soviet Union. This approach is dictated today by life and the actual situation. Everything is closely interconnected here and drawn into a single tight knot. It has been ascertained entirely definitely now that it is impossible to conduct negotiations and come to an agreement on strategic arms without a solution also of the question of intermediate-range nuclear weapons: these weapons, which are deployed in West Europe, targeted at the USSR and capable of reaching its territory, are by nature and power strategic for the USSR and its allies. At the same time any success in questions of limiting and reducing the said two types of nuclear arms is inconceivable under the conditions of an arms race in space, the plans for which--in the guise of a "broad-scale antimissile defense"--are being hatched in Washington. As a result of realization of such plans the balance sheet for general peace would be a deficit balance. All the more necessary, then, is strict observance of the accord reached in Geneva in all its parts and in all three interconnected areas.

If the American side abandons the provocative plans to extend the arms race to space, we may go as far as to speak of impressive real results and very important reductions in strategic nuclear and intermediate-range weapons.

The nearing of this goal could be helped by the imposition by the USSR and the United States for the entire period of the negotiations of a moratorium, as the Soviet side proposes, on the creation, including scientific research, testing and deployment of strike space arms and a freezing of strategic offensive arms. Simultaneously there should be a halt to the deployment of American intermediate-range missiles in Europe and, correspondingly, the buildup of retaliatory measures on the part of the Soviet Union.

Aspiring to honest dialogue and expressing a readiness to again demonstrate good will, the USSR imposed from 7 April through November 1985 a moratorium on the deployment of its intermediate-range missiles and halted the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe.

II

In the sphere of a limitation and curbing of and a halt to the nuclear arms race a freeze on nuclear arms by all states which possess them, quantitatively and qualitatively, would be of importance. Proceeding from this, the Soviet Union advanced a specific program of measures in the sphere of a global freeze on nuclear arms. The Soviet Union does not consider a nuclear arms freeze an end in itself. At the same time, however, this action, having put a stop to the nuclear arms race, would facilitate the subsequent process of their reduction and liquidation.

In the context of a qualitative curbing of the nuclear arms race importance is attached to a general ban on nuclear weapon tests. The Soviet Union presents a wide-ranging action program in this area also. It advocates the immediate resumption of the tripartite Soviet-American-British negotiations on a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests which were suspended by the United States in 1980. Ratification of the Soviet-American treaties signed in 1974 and 1976 on limiting underground nuclear weapon tests and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes could be an important step on this path. The Soviet Union also proposes that all states possessing nuclear weapons declare a moratorium on all nuclear explosions as of a date mutually agreed between them through the conclusion of a treaty. It agrees that the date of the start of the moratorium be, as proposed by many public figures, 6 August 1985--the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

Under conditions where the United States is declining to resume the tripartite negotiations on the complete banning of nuclear weapon tests it is essential for the speediest elaboration of the corresponding treaty to make the maximum use of the Geneva Disarmament Conference. Unfortunately, owing to the position of the United States, which is sidetracking the discussion in the direction of artificially exaggerated control problems, it has not as yet been possible at the conference to begin the specific elaboration of the provisions of the treaty itself.

A task of paramount importance is preventing the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. This is a kind of "second front" of the struggle against the nuclear threat as a whole. The creep of nuclear weapons across the planet and their appearance in areas of higher-than-usual military danger would lead to a sharp destabilization of the situation in the world, the growth of the nuclear threat and an intensification of the nuclear arms race. The Soviet Union consistently advocates a strengthening of the international conditions of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the basis of which is the treaty which has been in effect since 1970 and which reliably shuts off all paths of the possible proliferation of nuclear weapons. According to the treaty, supervision of compliance with its basic provisions is entrusted to the IAEA. In order to preclude the use of assistance in the sphere of peaceful use of nuclear energy for military purposes the agency's statutes stipulate the appropriate guarantees* in respect nuclear and other materials, services, equipment and technical means and information.

* In English, as distinct from security "guarantees," IAEA guarantees are denoted by the word "safeguards".

Two systems of safeguards operate within the IAEA. One is in respect of the subscribers to the treaty, the other is of those who have not signed it. The basic differences of these systems amount to the fact that Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty safeguards automatically extend to the entire activity pertaining to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes of the subscriber-countries, whereas the safeguards applied to states not subscribing to the treaty pertain only to part of the states' nuclear activity and may be realized only in respect of nuclear materials, individual supplies and so forth. Control methods and procedures which are entirely substantiated from the scientific-technical viewpoint have now been elaborated in the IAEA and are being applied extensively. As a whole the system of IAEA safeguards is constructed such that the requirements, purposes and procedures of control are of as universal a nature as possible.

Strict compliance with the terms of nonproliferation is an important condition and prerequisite of states' really extensive cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy. The USSR supports such cooperation both bilaterally and within the IAEA framework.

A strengthening of the nonnuclear states' security guarantees* signifying the nonuse of nuclear weapons against them could be an important measure in strengthening the practice of nonproliferation. The Soviet Union has declared repeatedly that it will never use nuclear weapons against states which renounce the production and acquisition of such weapons and do not permit their deployment on their territory. An effective method of strengthening the nonnuclear states' security guarantees would be the conclusion of a corresponding international convention. New possibilities are also revealed by the USSR's proposal that all states possessing nuclear weapons, as a first step toward the conclusion of such a convention, make analogous statements or ones which are close in terms of content on the nonuse of nuclear weapons against nonnuclear states which do not have such on their territory. The USSR is also ready to conclude bilateral agreements on this score with any such nonnuclear state. Nondeployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of countries where they do not exist would also facilitate the tasks of strengthening the practice of nonproliferation.

An essential direction of consolidation of the practice of nonproliferation is the creation of nuclear-free zones. Such zones are not a utopia. Proof of this was the conclusion of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (the Tlatelolco Treaty). The efforts in this sphere have already produced definite results. It is necessary to multiply them in all directions, step by step freeing the face of the Earth of the nuclear pox. The USSR has been and remains a consistent supporter of the creation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of Europe, the Near East and Africa and supports the proposal that a nuclear-free zone be created in the South Pacific.

* Such guarantees are termed "negative" as distinct from "positive"-- commitments of the USSR, United States and Britain made via the UN Security Council in 1968 and providing for certain actions to provide support for nonnuclear states in the event of their falling victim to nuclear aggression.

Of course, as long as there are nuclear weapons in the world there will continue to be the possibility of a nuclear catastrophe also. For this reason the norm of behavior of states possessing such weapons should be today even a policy of reducing nuclear arms as far as their liquidation.

The USSR advocated the exclusion of nuclear weapons from the arms arsenal immediately following the appearance of the atomic bomb.

It submitted the corresponding proposal to the United Nations back in 1946. Thanks to the persistent efforts of the Soviet Union, the liquidation of nuclear weapons completely and everywhere was defined as the goal of the new Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. This is an agreement of exceptional importance inasmuch as Soviet-American joint documents did not contain such wording previously.

The path toward the complete extirpation of nuclear weapons should lie via the formulation of a program of stage-by-stage nuclear disarmament which would provide for a gradual reduction in nuclear arms stockpiles as far as their complete liquidation and in this framework the achievement of accords on a halt to the development of new nuclear weapons systems and the production of nuclear warheads and their delivery systems. It might be possible as a first step to study the question of a ban on the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. Of course, it cannot be divorced from other nuclear disarmament measures. What is needed is a comprehensive approach, which is designed to ensure that each individual measure be organically inscribed in the entire program of nuclear disarmament.

In elaborating the corresponding steps it will be necessary to coordinate the methods and forms of control which would satisfy all the parties concerned and contribute to the effective implementation of the accords which have been reached. The experience of control activity of the IAEA and the Agency's possibilities, in particular, could be used for this.

The Soviet Union is ready to participate in all work on the coordination of nuclear disarmament measures. It is up to the other nuclear powers, primarily the United States.

III

The elaboration and implementation of arms limitation and disarmament measures in the space and nuclear fields presupposes simultaneous efforts to strengthen the political-legal guarantees of security of the preservation of peace. Mistrust in relations between countries would thereby be dispelled and a climate would be created contributing to the process of the curbing of nuclear and space arms and a transition to real disarmament.

Under present conditions there would be exceptional significance for removing the danger of universal war in each nuclear power's assumption of a commitment on no first use of such weapons. This is the direct duty of the nuclear powers. Approaching its status as nuclear power and permanent member of the Security Council with all responsibility, the USSR has already assumed such a commitment unilaterally.

The adoption of such an undertaking per the example of the Soviet Union by all the NATO nuclear powers would contribute, in particular, to a revision of the military doctrines and concepts of various states (including the tendencies toward the "acceptability" of nuclear wars), which would create the prerequisites for a halt to the stockpiling and subsequently a reduction in and ultimately the destruction of nuclear arsenals. In the political-legal respect such an undertaking would be a substantial practical step in reducing the nuclear threat. Indeed, in the event of an agreement being reached or a commitment assumed on no first use of nuclear weapons, there would be no subsequent nuclear strikes, which would in fact be tantamount to banning the use of nuclear weapons. In addition, the assumption of a commitment on no first use of nuclear weapons is not simply a declaration. From the viewpoint of military activity such a decision means that in the organizational development of the armed forces more attention has to be paid to the tasks of preventing the growth of a military conflict using conventional arms into a nuclear conflict, in connection with which an even stricter framework is put up in troop and staff training, determination of the arms composition and the organization of tighter control precluding the unsanctioned launch of nuclear weapons--from tactical to strategic.

If the USSR's example were followed by the nuclear powers which have yet to do so, a truly historic step would thereby have been taken strengthening international trust and of practical significance in the prevention of a nuclear war. The corresponding commitments could be assumed unilaterally by each state possessing nuclear weapons. This, strictly speaking, is the shortest route and does not require special negotiations and agreements. The USSR would also be prepared for the nuclear powers' commitments on no first use of nuclear weapons, as proposed by certain nonaligned countries, to be recorded in a single document of an international-law nature, in a convention, for example. It also supports the nonaligned countries' proposal on the conclusion of a convention banning the use of nuclear weapons to which all the nuclear powers subscribe.

Realistic circles in the West are evaluating at its worth the USSR's unilateral assumption of the commitment on no first use of nuclear weapons and understand the groundlessness of the negative attitude of the United States and its allies toward this proposal. "To the extent to which this commitment has been noticed in the West," the well-known American diplomat and historian G. Kennan writes, "the reaction to it has represented cynical mistrust and underestimation. But it may be asked: is such an unfounded rejection really justified? The Soviet Union's unilateral renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons has been constantly and solemnly confirmed at the highest level of state and government responsibility and accompanied by the acknowledgment that nuclear war is a catastrophe for all...."

Everyone who thinks in the categories of the nuclear-space era is aware that the adoption of such a large-scale action as renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons by all the nuclear powers would signify a genuine political turning point in the business of strengthening trust--and not only between nuclear but all other states also.

In the same category of substantial means of strengthening trust and security is the socialist states' peace initiative promulgated in January 1983--the proposal for the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact and North Atlantic Treaty States. The core of such a treaty would be a commitment on no first use of both nuclear and conventional weapons.

Unfortunately, the Warsaw Pact countries have yet to receive from the governments of the NATO states a serious response to this proposal. The explanation should most likely be sought in the policy of the United States and its NATO allies in the military sphere, the contours of which by the end of 1983 had acquired specific features of linkage of the missile "rearmament" with implementation of the "Rogers Plan," which puts the emphasis on an accelerated conventional arms buildup. This is why the West is stubbornly declining the proposals of the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries on no first use against each other of either nuclear or conventional arms. And, consequently, on no first use of military force in general.

The removal from the practice of international relations of force in any of its manifestations--nuclear or conventional--would contribute to the speediest completion of work on a world treaty on the nonuse of force in international relations, a draft of which was submitted by the Soviet Union for study by the United Nations in 1976. The conclusion of such a treaty would be a practical measure of implementation of a most important requirement of the nuclear-space age--noninfringement of the security of any party. "The final renunciation of the use of force as an instrument of national policy is an important element of the policy of ensuring security for all," the Palme Commission report emphasizes.

In the light of what has been said the complete groundlessness of the assertions of some NATO governments that the Soviet Union's assumption of the historic commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons virtually means that the USSR aspires to preserve for itself the possibility of first use of conventional weapons becomes obvious. The proposals submitted by the Warsaw Pact states provide precisely for a ban on the use of both nuclear and conventional weapons.

The renunciation by all states, primarily the states possessing nuclear weapons, of propaganda of nuclear war in any variant thereof--global or limited--would contribute to the molding of a moral-political atmosphere in which all attempts to unleash a nuclear war would be doomed to fail. In particular, it is a question of the renunciation of the elaboration, promotion, spread and propaganda of political and military doctrines and concepts designed to substantiate the "legitimacy" of first use of nuclear weapons, as, in general, the "permissibility" of the unleashing of nuclear war. The Declaration on the Condemnation of Nuclear War adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union at the UN General Assembly 38th Session appeals to all states for this.

Finally, political-legal actions pertaining to the prevention of nuclear war incorporate the prevention of the chance or unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons, prevention of the possibility of a surprise attack and so forth.

In the most concentrated form the position of the socialist states on the entire set of questions of removal of the threat of nuclear war was formulated in their working paper presented to the Disarmament Committee in March 1984. Having confirmed the resolve to embark on the elaboration of urgent and practical measures to prevent nuclear war, the socialist countries again appealed to all participants in the conference to whom this concerns to display political good will and occupy a constructive position on the vitally important problem of preventing nuclear war.

IV

Intelligence persuades us that together with space and nuclear weapons all weapons of mass destruction in general must be removed from states' arsenals.

Primarily there is an acute need for the speediest banning and liquidation of such barbaric weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons. The USSR proposes a stimulation of states' efforts aimed at formulation of an appropriate international convention. In the summer of 1982 it presented a document on the basic provisions of a convention on this question. The Soviet initiative affords an opportunity for the achievement of a mutually acceptable accord. The future convention must, of course, provide for strict control, which together with the use of national means would also incorporate international procedures, including coordinated on-site inspection. In the event of suspicions of violations of the convention arising (including the use of chemical weapons) such a procedure could be conducted upon request, on a voluntary basis, for supervision of the destruction of chemical weapon stockpiles and the limited authorized production of supertoxic lethal chemicals--on a systematic, that is, obligatory basis (in accordance with a certain quota, for example).

In subsequent years the Soviet Union presented a number of new initiatives. It expressed a readiness to incorporate in the convention a provision on a ban on the use of chemical weapons and put forward a number of proposals designed to reliably guarantee the ban on the production of chemical weapons at peaceful chemical industry enterprises and facilitate control in this sphere. It presented ideas concerning the elaboration of a special procedure of the destruction of chemical weapon stockpiles which would ensure the security of all subscriber-states and submitted a proposal concerning the organization and activity of an international body for consultations, exchange of information and inspection assistance in the interests of compliance with the provisions of the convention. The USSR considers it essential that states avoid actions which could complicate the negotiations, in particular, renounce the production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapon on the territories of other states.

The socialist countries' proposal concerning the freeing of Europe from this type of weapon also follows in the channel of efforts to liquidate chemical weapon arsenals. And if there has as yet been no progress in this sphere, the reason is clear. The point being that the policy of the United States and its closest allies at the negotiations is essentially aimed against the removal of chemical weapons from states' arsenals. They have gambled in their

military plans on the development of a new, particularly dangerous type of chemical weapon--binary. To camouflage such a policy Washington is attempting to demonstrate at international forums an affected assertiveness and speculating on the truly important control problem.

The draft convention submitted by the United States at the Geneva Disarmament Conference in April 1984, in particular, testifies to this. It was formulated, particularly in the section concerning control, such as to make it knowingly unacceptable to all who are really interested in leaving no room in the world for chemical weapons. The all-embracing nature of a ban on chemical weapons is not sustained in the draft inasmuch as the use of herbicides for military purposes and also irritants in armed and other conflicts, that is, precisely the toxic chemicals which the United States once employed extensively at the time of its aggression in Vietnam, is removed from the ban.

Nor are things any better when it comes to questions of control. Inspection based on a "standing invitation" is offered as a "new word". Upon disclosure of this euphonious wording, however, it turns out that countries must upon demand automatically grant the inspectors--within 24 hours--unimpeded access to any enterprise, any facility, regardless of whether or not it is connected with the production of chemical weapons or chemical industry in general. Of course, there is no need for such, if you will, control from the viewpoint of the task of banning chemical weapons. On the other hand there is a direct danger of the disclosure of military and commercial secrets unconnected with questions of the production, stockpiling and storage of chemical weapons.

Something else is characteristic also. In proposing the above-mentioned absurd system of inspection the United States is by no means about to extend such control to its country. According to its outline of control, it would encompass only enterprises "belonging to governments or controlled by governments". In other words, in the Soviet Union and the other socialist states and also in countries with partially nationalized industry, where all enterprises or the majority of them are state-owned, practically all civil and military facilities, even those unconnected with chemical production, would be subject to control, but in the United States private enterprises, including the biggest chemical corporations, which are capable of producing chemical weapons, would be excluded from the sphere of control. What is this if not manifest discrimination against a whole group of states?

Such an approach is all the more unacceptable if the possibility of the production at private enterprises of binary weapon components is considered. Incidentally, the American draft glosses over altogether the question of banning binary weapons. Extremely dangerous supertoxic lethal chemicals (irrespective of the quantities produced, what is more), if they are formally intended for peaceful purposes and not for the tasks of protection against chemical agents, also remain in practice beyond the field of vision.

When tackling arms limitation issues it has to be considered that our world even now stands on the threshold of new scientific-technical achievements far more far-reaching than the discovery of nuclear energy. In the wake of the threat of the use of nuclear and chemical means of mass destruction there arises a danger connected with assimilation of the results of biology--genetic

engineering. Just as nuclear weapons are capable of irreversibly altering the environment globally, including the radiation situation in the thin layer of the biosphere, so molecular biology and gene engineering could radically alter the stable system of the transfer of hereditary information which ensures the evolution and very existence of life and intelligence on Earth. The writer (Lem) painted in the novel ("Edem") a gloomy picture of what could happen to man if this achievement became a toy in the hands of blindly operating social forces.

With experience of nuclear and chemical weapons mankind must not fall into this new trap, as, equally, into the as yet unknown snares which could arise as a byproduct of scientific-technical progress. It is essential for this that people recognize the danger of the development and production of new weapons of mass destruction as new implements of murder and suicide and not simply a sophisticated means of conducting military operations. "Preventive" actions are needed in this connection.

The USSR consistently advocates a ban on the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. It deems expedient the conclusion of an all-embracing agreement on this question and at the same time is prepared to reach agreement also on the banning of individual new types of weapon of mass destruction. It is essential, in particular, to complete the elaboration of a treaty banning radiological weapons.

V

Together with weapons of mass destruction, primarily nuclear weapons, the process of arms limitation and disarmament should also embrace the sphere of conventional arms. Here, as in the sphere of nuclear weapons, the military-equipment revolution demands a new approach to the idea of the nature of the means of warfare which are being created which has taken shape. Varieties of conventional weapons are being developed which in terms of their power of destruction approximate nuclear warheads and threaten, given the modern delivery systems, the extermination of people on a mass scale. In the sphere of conventional arms a task of paramount importance is erecting, before it is too late, reliable barriers in the way of their stockpiling and engaging in appropriate effective actions.

The Soviet Union is an emphatic supporter of negotiations capable of opening the way to an appreciable lowering of the present levels of conventional arms and armed forces, whether globally or in individual regions. This process, the USSR believes, could begin with an accord on the freezing of the levels of the armed forces and conventional arms of the permanent members of the Security Council and other militarily important states.

A useful step would be a lengthening of the list of states which subscribe to the 1981 convention banning or limiting the use of specific types of conventional weapon which could be considered to inflict inordinate damage or which are indiscriminate in their action. Unfortunately, many militarily important states, including almost all the NATO members, including the United States, do not subscribe to the convention. The Soviet Union, which was one of the first to subscribe to this convention, advocates further negotiations to ban or limit the use of other types of such weapons.

Together with curbing the growth of conventional arms effective measures for their nonproliferation are required also. It is a question of limiting the sale and supply of conventional arms, the volume of which is now gaged in tens of billions of dollars. The Soviet Union believes that both Soviet-American and multilateral efforts are important in this question, and for this reason other states could participate in the study thereof also.

Limiting and halting the conventional arms race also puts on the agenda of international life the question of naval arms. The USSR was one of the first to present a number of initiatives aimed at limiting naval activity, curbing the naval arms race and extending confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans. Thus it proposed the start of negotiations on limiting naval activity and naval arms in which all the major naval powers and other interested states would participate. Agreement could be reached as an urgent measure, for example, on the nonexpansion of states' naval activity in areas of conflict or tension.

It would be expedient to find solutions which would eliminate the situation where fleets of the big powers ply the waters for a long time at a great distance from their home shores. The withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons from certain areas of the oceans, the establishment of limits on the presence there of ships of various classes and other similar restrictions would appear useful also.

It might be possible to go even further in the direction of the direct and effective limitation of naval arms. For example, to reach agreement on limiting the number of warships of the main classes. Simultaneously there should be discussion of the imposition of restrictions on antisubmarine forces and weapons and also measures in respect of naval bases on foreign territory. The question of a reduction on a balanced basis in the number of ships in the fleets of the big powers could be examined subsequently, attention being paid here to warships (aircraft carriers, for example) of a particularly destabilizing nature and used for a show of strength and to put pressure on independent states.

Of course, the proposed measures must be elaborated and implemented in accordance with the principle of no detriment to anyone's security and with due regard for all the factors determining the correlation of forces at sea and also other areas of arms limitation affecting navies in one way or another. The USSR is prepared to also study measures which would ensure states' mutual confidence in observance of the assumed commitments.

However, owing to the position of the United States and a number of its allies, questions of limiting the conventional arms race have not been translated to the practical plane. And the reason for this lies in the military sphere, primarily in the fact that the United States has begun a new round of the race in such arms. It is an incontrovertible fact that the security of all countries--both large and small--would gain militarily as a result of a limitation of conventional, including naval, arms. Particular advantages would be derived by the nonnuclear countries, which, as recent years have shown, often prove to be the victims of conflicts involving the use of conventional arms.

VI

Inasmuch as security universally takes shape from security within the framework of individual geographical areas, its material and moral-political guarantees in the arms limitation and disarmament process should be created on both the global and regional levels.

The areas where there are huge weapons stockpiles are of particular significance in this respect. This applies primarily to the European continent, where the two most powerful military-political alliances in world history with an unprecedented concentration of troops and combat equipment confront one another directly. Nonetheless, increasingly new types of weapons are being introduced here and Pershings and cruise missiles, which are strategic for the Warsaw Pact countries, are being deployed. The NATO countries are also building up the nonnuclear potential here, which is being accompanied, in addition, by the advancement of manifestly provocative doctrines providing for preventive strikes to be launched with the help not only of nuclear but also conventional arms deep into "enemy" territory. Naturally, the balance in Europe, which is a guarantee of security on the continent, will be restored in any event, although this will occur at a higher and more dangerous level.

All this indicates that urgent and effective measures of a regional nature which would make it possible to straighten out the explosive situation which is taking shape here are essential in Europe. The appropriate prerequisites for this exist. They are contained in the wealth of experience of multilateral diplomacy which has been accumulated by the European states, in particular, in the elaboration of regional measures in the course of the all-European process begun by the signing of the Final Act in Helsinki in August 1975. This experience has shown that there are no international problems on which agreement cannot be reached given the political will on the part of all the parties. In the instances, on the other hand, where some difficulties have arisen (as at the Belgrade and Madrid meetings, for example) it has always been clear that they were predetermined not by the complexity of the problems but simply by the reluctance of certain states to bring matters to the point of agreement.

The task of curbing the nuclear arms race is the key task for peace and the security of the European peoples. A radical solution of this question would consist of Europe's complete liberation from nuclear weapons--both intermediate-range and tactical. It is particularly important now not to take any steps which could jack up the nuclear arms race on the continent even more.

There are many other areas of limiting the arms race here also. The creation of a kind of nuclear-free band which could stretch from North Europe through its central part to the Balkans. A possible accord on Europe's conversion into a continent free of chemical weapons. Efforts aimed at reducing the burden of military spending. And many other measures.

The achievement of practical results at two multilateral forums under way currently--the Vienna talks on a mutual reduction in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe and the Stockholm conference on measures to strengthen trust

and security and for disarmament in Europe--could also play its part from the viewpoint of a lessening of the military confrontation. Their successful completion would undoubtedly contribute to an improvement in the situation not only on the continent but far beyond it also.

Efforts to curb the arms race in Europe are of significance for more than just this region. First, they would serve as a kind of good-example policy for the countries and peoples inhabiting other parts of our planet. Second, specific measures "road-tested" in Europe could be used--with an adjustment for their specific conditions and singularities--in other parts of the world.

Of course, initiatives in the elaboration of regional measures cannot be the property, even less, the privilege of some one area of continent. It is important that the efforts made on a regional level be in tune with the measures aimed achievement of the global goal--disarmament and the strengthening of peace and security worldwide.

VII

The introduction in international politics of the concepts of peace zones and their realization in practice would be of exceptional significance from the viewpoint of regional security, including arms limitation and disarmament. Proposals concerning the creation of such peace zones in various parts of the world were first made on the eve and at the outset of the 1970's by the young independent states.

The UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session (1978) emphasized in its final document that "the creation of peace zones in various parts of the world on appropriate terms, which should be precisely determined freely by the states interested in creating a zone, with regard for the singularities of such a zone and the principles of the UN Charter and in accordance with international law, could contribute to a strengthening of the security of the states located within such zones and international peace and security as a whole."

A generally accepted "peace zone" concept does not yet exist. The proposals of various states, primarily nonaligned states, express certain thoughts concerning the volume of commitments of the participants in the zone. It could contain, these countries believe, commitments providing fully or partially for the nuclear-free status of this region or the other and its complete or partial demilitarization. Such a zone could to a certain extent be similar to a zone free of nuclear weapons, differing from the latter in the fewer details of treaty aspects pertaining to the nuclear-free status of the region and at the same time in the broader commitments of the subscriber-states in terms of volume. Thus it could incorporate both the nuclear-free status of this region or the other and a set of measures regulating relations between the subscriber-states in the interests of a strengthening of peace and security. It could contain political and material security guarantees, measures of regional cooperation, that is, commitments concerning relations between states of the zone themselves, and also commitments of other states incorporated therein, primarily those such as protection of the territorial integrity of the countries of the zone against outside encroachments, guarantees of the sovereignty of developing countries over their natural resources and so forth. The "peace zone" concept could incorporate as an integral part provisions of a general political nature and also provisions regulating freedom of the open sea and water expanse of the aeronautical zone beyond the territorial waters of littoral states.

Observance of the international-law conditions of the peace zone could be guaranteed by the permanent members of the Security Council and, possibly, states which avail themselves extensively of shipping routes in the oceans generally and the waters of the given region in particular. In its content the peace zone is simultaneously an area of both political and military detente.

A whole number of countries advocates that the conditions of a peace zone incorporate the following specific norms and principles: noninterference in states' internal affairs, the peaceful solution of disputes without foreign interference and adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence; the creation of conditions of friendship, mutual trust and cooperation of states of the given region, prevention of potential regional conflicts and a reduction in tension among states of the region; liquidation of all military bases in the peace zone; nondeployment of nuclear weapons and types of weapon of mass destruction; liquidation or limitation of the military presence of the great powers; limitation of the sale and supplies of weapons to states of the peace zone to national defense needs; the impermissibility of contamination by radioactive fallout; respect by all states for the status of the peace zone; nonadmission of offensive weapons in the zone.

The Soviet Union actively supports the idea of the creation of peace zones in various regions. The CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th CPSU Congress expressed support for the developing states' proposals concerning the creation of peace zones in the Indian Ocean, Southeast Asia and other parts of the world. The decisions of the All-European Conference were evaluated in the report as being in fact aimed at all Europe becoming such a zone.

In January 1983 the Prague Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact states supported the proposal for the conversion of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and cooperation and the holding of the appropriate negotiations. The Soviet initiative on confidence-building and security measures in the Far East also moves in the direction of an improvement in the international situation in Asia.

At the 1 March 1984 session the CPSU Central Committee Politburo examined questions "connected with the situation in the Indian Ocean region, where as a result of the militarist actions of the United States and some of its NATO allies military-political tension is increasing. It was confirmed that the Soviet Union supports the nonaligned states' proposals concerning the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a peace zone and the speediest convening for this purpose of an international conference under the aegis of the United Nations."

Recently a whole number of socialist states has advanced initiatives for the creation of peace zones. Among these are Mongolia's proposals concerning the conclusion of a convention on mutual nonaggression and the nonuse of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states and also the DPRK's proposals concerning the conversion of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone and a zone of peace.

As far as the United States is concerned, it, abiding by the policy of achieving global superiority over the Soviet Union, is opposing the peace zones, seeing them as an obstacle in the way of realization of its militarist plans.

A curbing of the arms race at the regional level would undoubtedly contribute to a stabilization of the situation in specific areas of the world and the prevention of the emergence of crisis situations in explosive points on our planet and would be an important contribution to the formation of a more secure world.

VIII

Under current conditions the implementation of practical measures to limit arms and for disarmament is entirely possible.

The sole "argument" being used by the opponents of disarmament amounts to the problem of control. They are attempting to heap the blame on the Soviet Union here. But this is a distortion of the real facts. The USSR is no less and possibly more interested than others in proper control. Such control, it is convinced, should be adequate to the specific arms limitation and disarmament measures. General agreement was reached on this at the UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session. Upon the formulation of international agreements in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament the Soviet side participates actively and constructively in the coordination of the appropriate measures for the purpose of ensuring confidence in the parties' compliance with the assumed commitments. This may be said of all the agreements currently in effect to which the Soviet Union subscribes. Coordination on a draft agreement was completed in 1984 in the course of negotiations between representatives of the USSR and the IAEA conducted in accordance with a Soviet initiative on putting parts of peaceful nuclear activity in the Soviet Union under the authority's control. The corresponding agreement was signed in February 1985.

The USSR's policy in questions of control does not preclude in principle the possibility of the creation of appropriate international mechanisms for verifying the implementation of far-reaching measures of real disarmament if a need for this is dictated by the essence of the disarmament measures themselves. It is well known that the Soviet plan for general and complete disarmament submitted for examination by the United Nations back at the start of the 1960's provided for the creation of an international control organization. However, the Soviet Union believed and continues to believe that control measures divorced from arms limitation agreements are unwarranted and capable merely of harming the cause of disarmament.

The question of control must not be the subject of an unscrupulous game and must not be used to block negotiations on specific arms limitation and disarmament measures or to undermine the agreements on such measures which were formulated earlier. Yet such is the appearance of the policy of the United States and a number of its allies, whose demands are based on a kind of "deterrence" doctrine in respect of the violators of agreements, as if the states did not enter into such voluntarily! And the Western proposals concerning the making available of information on states' military potentials

divorced from the elaboration and implementation of measures of military detente and disarmament are inscribed perhaps in the "doctrine" of espionage. After all, were the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states to consent to the notorious concept of "transparency" of the activity of the armed forces being foisted on them in Stockholm, Washington would be guaranteed the "legitimate," so to speak, legalized collection of intelligence information on military potentials. Furthermore, and this is characteristic of the "double-standard" approach being employed by the United States, such a process would be one-sided inasmuch as the Washington scenario excludes American territory from the "transparency".

Given a serious, responsible approach to control issues, all the questions connected with this cannot serve as an obstacle to the conclusion of specific agreements but, on the contrary, should contribute to their increased efficacy.

Political realism in the nuclear-space age leaves no other choice than the accomplishment by turn of the tasks of arms limitation and disarmament. The development of arms--from David's sling through nuclear weapons--has reached a point beyond which their continued buildup could lead mankind to catastrophe. On the other hand under current conditions there are practically no types of weapons which cannot be limited or banned per an agreement, on a mutually acceptable basis.

Arms limitation and disarmament are the central link in the chain of measures leading to the formation of international security guarantees. A link which is inseparable from security in all other areas. At the same time it is also a sphere of the broad positive interaction of states different in their socioeconomic and political nature for these questions concern an interest common to all states and peoples--preventing nuclear catastrophe.

The experience of the 1970's, which are known as a period of detente, also speaks in support of arms limitation and disarmament. The documents of this period, including the Helsinki Final Act, represent an example of how international relations may be built if we are guided by the principles of equality and equal security and the realities which have taken shape in the world and if we do not aspire to any advantages but seek mutually acceptable solutions and accords.

The Soviet Union, as M.S. Gorbachev emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum, declares again and again that it will firmly abide by the Leninist policy of peace and peaceful coexistence, which is determined by our social system and our morality and world outlook. We advocate regular, correct, civilized, if you will, international relations based on genuine respect for the rules of international law. But it should be as clear as can be: only given imperialism's renunciation of attempts to solve by military means the historical dispute between the two social systems will it be possible to lead international relations into the channel of normal cooperation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

SOVIET SCIENTIFIC PEACE COUNCIL ON SDI, DELHI DECLARATION

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 18-20

[Text] A meeting of the Scientific Council for Study of Peace and Disarmament chaired by P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which discussed the results of the meeting of the world public in Athens in connection with the Delhi Declaration of six nonnuclear powers and also problems of the struggle to prevent the militarization of space and the tasks confronting Soviet scientists in this connection, was held on 22 February 1985 in Moscow.

Representatives of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat and also other scientific and public organizations participated in the meeting.

A paper on the meeting of the world public in Athens was delivered by Academician G.A. Arbatov, a participant therein. An analysis of R. Reagan's so-called SDI concept and its military-political repercussions was made by Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Space Research.

The following spoke in the debate: Academician S.L. Tikhvinskiy, An.A. Gromyko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Prof O.N. Bykov, deputy chairman of the Scientific Council, Doctor of Historical Sciences A.A. Kokoshin, deputy chairman of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, Doctor of Legal Sciences M.I. Lazarev, deputy director of the Institute of Latin America, and others.

In connection with the discussion of the American plan for the militarization of space the Scientific Council adopted the declaration "For Prevention of an Arms Race in Space and a Halt Thereto on Earth". The council also adopted an appeal

to the heads of government and state of the six nonnuclear powers which authored the Delhi Declaration.

Both documents are published below.

Appeal Against Space Militarization

The Scientific Council for Study of Peace and Disarmament welcomes the understanding reached on the start on 12 March 1985 of new Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on the entire set of questions concerning space and nuclear arms--strategic and intermediate-range--and the need to study and resolve them in interconnection. We declare our emphatic support for the goal of upcoming negotiations, which are called on to formulate effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in space and a halt thereto on Earth, the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms and the strengthening of strategic stability. The members of the Scientific Council attach particular significance to the agreement that has been reached that efforts in respect of arms limitation and reduction should lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons completely and everywhere and express the hope that the participants in the negotiations will abide by these accords honestly and seriously, fully aware of their high responsibility for the fate of peace.

The will of the international community of states to prevent the spread of the arms race to space was clearly expressed in the resolution of the UN General Assembly 39th Session. The Scientific Council declares its unconditional support for this resolution, fully aware that realization of the U.S. Administration's plans in respect of the so-called "star wars" would mean that it would not be possible to speak of any reduction, even less, elimination of nuclear weapons as a realistic and attainable goal.

A dependable solution of the problems of ensuring security may be achieved only by way of mutually acceptable agreements based on the principle of equality and equal security.

The Scientific Council appeals to the participants in the negotiations to do everything possible to not let slip the opportunity for the achievement of such agreements and to display the due political will to justify the hopes of the peoples. We consider it of fundamental importance that the American side refrain from creating artificial difficulties in the negotiations and display the necessary restraint in its actions.

We call on the peace-loving public and all people of good will to strive to ensure that the participants in the negotiations not engage in actions capable of jeopardizing the likelihood of the achievement of agreements on an equal and mutually acceptable basis and that they be guided by the lofty human mission of preserving peace on Earth.

A positive outcome of the Geneva negotiations could exert a salutary influence on an improvement in the situation in the world and be a big step on the way to preventing nuclear war.

Appeal to Delhi Declaration States

The Scientific Council for Study of Peace and Disarmament welcomes the efforts of the heads of state and government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden, which were directed toward a halt to the arms race and an improvement in the international situation.

Particular significance and urgency is attached to such efforts on the part of influential statesmen in the current situation. They represent an undoubted contribution to the struggle against the arms race and the threat of nuclear war.

We value highly the initiative of the heads of six nonnuclear states expressed in the Delhi Declaration and the appeal to the peoples, parliaments and governments of the whole world and the document in support of this declaration adopted as a result of a meeting of prominent representatives of political and public circles of many countries in Athens in January 1985.

The Scientific Council is convinced that nuclear war cannot be allowed in any form. All powers possessing nuclear weapons must renounce first use thereof. The USSR has already assumed such a commitment, having given guarantees of the nonuse of nuclear weapons against states which do not have such on their territory. Making such guarantees and commitments universal is the imperative of international relations of our time. We support the call for a freezing of nuclear arsenals and advocate the banning of nuclear weapons, a reduction in the stockpiles thereof and ultimately their complete liquidation.

It is important to prevent the spread of the nuclear race to new spheres: it stands to reason that such weapons cannot be allowed to penetrate space. The militarization of space would have serious destabilizing consequences for the entire international situation, would disrupt compliance with important agreements on arms limitation and disarmament and would make the task of the reduction and subsequent liquidation of nuclear weapons practically insoluble.

The Scientific Council fully supports the demand for the conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete banning of nuclear weapons tests. This treaty could be a big step on the way to nuclear disarmament.

The Scientific Council for Study of Peace and Disarmament supports the proposal that part of the resources which would be released as a result of a reduction in military spending be channeled into assistance to the developing countries.

Soviet scientists consider it their duty to contribute in every way possible to mobilization of the world community for struggle to overcome the obstacles in the way to international peace and security. They advocate a political settlement of crisis situations in various regions of our planet, a renunciation of the use or threat of force in international relations and strict observance of the principle of noninterference in other countries' internal affairs.

The Scientific Council calls for a holding back from any steps which could harm the upcoming negotiations between the USSR and the United States, the goal of which both countries have undertaken to make the prevention of an arms race in space, a halt thereto on Earth and ultimately the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons.

The members of the Scientific Council wish the statesmen who signed the Delhi Declaration success in their noble activity for the good of international peace and cooperation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TSK KPSS "Pravda", "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

PEACE MOVEMENT FLOURISHING DESPITE REPRESSION, SPLITTING TACTICS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 21-32

[Article by Ye. Silin: "The Antiwar Movement at the Current Stage"]

[Excerpts]

The peace movement has assumed unprecedented proportions in the first half of the 1980's, particularly in Europe. Millions of people have been involved not only in serious debate on questions of war, peace and security but also in numerous demonstrations against nuclear arms and for disarmament. The actual participation of masses of the population in the antiwar movement, the unprecedented expansion of their political and social composition, the use of new forms of combating the military danger and the increased internationalization of the actions of the peace-loving public--all this has forced different political spheres, including opponents of the peace movement, to begin to talk about the serious nature of this phenomenon and to seek answers to the questions raised by the movement. Of course, the thrust of the search is determined by what side of the barricades in the great battle for peace this political force or the other is on and what position it occupies in respect of the main issue of the present day--the need to prevent nuclear war. The greater the threat to civilization in the imperialist policy of spurring tension, the more assertive the forces of man's self-preservation become.

The objective concurrence of the main demands of the participants in the peace movement in the capitalist countries and the content of the constructive initiatives of the Soviet state and its allies is very alarming to the creators of the "crusade against communism" policy. And this is understandable. The socialist countries are endeavoring to tackle the tasks which K. Marx and F. Engels set the working class in the international sphere: the simple laws of morality and justice by which individual people are guided in their relationships should be the highest laws in relations between peoples also.* A most important mission of the foreign policy and the entire international activity of socialism consists not only of ensuring favorable, peaceful conditions for building the new society but also the establishment of just principles in international relations universally.

* See K. Marx, F. Engels, "Works," vol 16, p 11.

The acquisition of military superiority over the socialist world appeared attainable to the most bellicose groupings of the ruling class which assumed office in the United States on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's. They went for the biggest adventure, in which they involved their allies also--the deployment in West Europe of new intermediate-range nuclear missiles. This adventure is proving to be a serious miscalculation in a whole number of parameters. First, it has not been possible to achieve military superiority over the USSR and the socialist community. Second, in speeding up NATO's rearmament and deploying American first-strike missiles in Europe the Atlantic strategists have brought retaliatory and adequate countermeasures on the part of the socialist countries. In addition, the aggressive actions of the imperialist circles (including realization of the "star wars" plans) undertaken under cover of the "Soviet military threat" myth have caused an unprecedented wave of public protests against the military threat and the arms race, specifically, against the new American missiles in Europe and the transfer of the arms race to space.

The debate on the missile question and then surrounding the problem of the militarization of space has caused in political and public circles of the West such serious contradictions and fissures that a number of observers has begun to term the American missiles imposed on West Europe Reagan's "Pyrrhic victory". The West's political establishment has emerged from the "missiles battle" far from as cohesive as the zealots of "Atlantic unity" would have wished. The exasperation of reactionary and militarist circles in connection with the assertiveness of the antiwar movement reached great intensity at the start of the 1980's, when the peace protests in the West (despite all their differences and frequently contradictory trends) acquired a common denominator--preventing the deployment of new American missiles in West Europe. It was then that the snobbish disregard for the masses on the part of the armchair pseudoplanners of "limited," "protracted" and "global" nuclear wars came to be replaced by an endeavor to activate all available levers to reduce to nothing the effectiveness of the movement, which, as has become clear, has considerable opportunities for counteracting decisions adopted by NATO and rebuffing the intrigues of the warmongers.

Voluminous literature and a mass of other evidence throw light on the methods by which the militarist forces' offensive against the antiwar movement has been conducted and is being carried out currently. It is a question of returning it to the sphere of a "harmless pacifism" incapable of exerting any influence on the implementation of existing and the adoption of new decisions in the sphere of war preparations.

According to the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN, the West's repressive and political-propaganda machinery was set the task of making a decisive attempt to neutralize the influence of the peace movement before the end of December 1983.* The deadline for its accomplishment coincided with the planned start of the deployment of the new American missiles in the FRG, Great Britain and Italy. "The war against the peace movements has assumed the form of active campaigns, in which counterinformation and disinformation are the main

* See THE GUARDIAN, 4 April 1983.

weapons,"* the Finnish researcher E. Antola emphasizes. The research and university centers known for their ties to the military-industrial complex and sometimes outright dependence thereon have been the bases for such campaigns and the elaboration of their ideological equipment, strategy and tactics.

Special interdepartmental bodies have been set up in the United States, the FRG and Great Britain to coordinate actions against the mass antiwar movement. Whereas initially the governments of Western states tried to avoid direct discussion and debate with representatives of the peace movements (it appeared to them more convenient to ignore these movements as allegedly representing small groups of persons with little grasp of the "high matters" of security and defense), in time the direct or indirect intervention of the governments in such polemics became the norm, and some NATO governments demonstrated a capacity for acting with unusual flair, what is more.

Secret official documents, which became public property in Holland in 1982, testify that the country's intelligence services had attempted to penetrate the peace movement. It follows from the documents that the authorities are engaged in honing methods of suppressing the population's anti-NATO protests in the event of "special circumstances". It is also known that NATO Headquarters has wide-ranging plans for actions against the participants in antinuclear campaigns under the conditions of war.

Thus the participants in the antiwar movement are victims twice--of legislation and the repressive machinery of the state. While preventing the adoption of political decisions against the arms race demanded by the masses bourgeois law rains down repression on people protesting against the disregard of highest political and state bodies (parliament, the government) for the will of a considerable proportion of the population.

The scope of the antiwar movement has forced into silence those who, like President R. Reagan, attempted to portray the peace protests as the result of "Moscow's intrigues". True, this proposition is now served up in a somewhat different wrapping. A standard accusation against the antiwar movement is that it is inspired by the communists or generally by figures of a left persuasion. Undoubtedly, many ideas and slogans of the diverse peace movements have in their time been advanced and continue to be advanced by the communist parties and other progressive organizations. This, incidentally, is yet further evidence that such ideas are taking possession of an increasingly wide circle of people and becoming comprehensible to the broad masses. But there is something else also: a number of parties of the left of West Europe (the British Labor Party and the Social Democrats of Sweden, the FRG and Finland) are themselves to this extent or the other on the side of the slogans of the peace movement. In addition, the demands of the fighters for peace and disarmament go beyond the framework of parties of the left; prominent figures and members of parliament of parties of the center and Christian democrats and representatives of other conservative forces are associating themselves with them.

* E. Antola, "Campaigns Against European Peace Movements," Turku, 1984, p 27.

Nonetheless, despite the obvious facts, the opponents of the antiwar movement continue to assert that the peace movements represent a "minority culture" allegedly not shared by the overwhelming majority of society. To judge by everything, persuading the participants in the antiwar movement and public opinion that following the start of deployment of the American missiles the peace movement should go into decline is now the main task of the Western mass media. Their other purpose is to prove that the people's masses, which even yesterday were attentively listening to the antiwar slogans, have today become indifferent to them, and the fighters for peace have allegedly found themselves in the position of a "shrill minority".

However, an objective analysis leads to entirely different conclusions. Of course, the participants in the antiwar movement are aware that struggling for peace and disarmament under present conditions is more difficult than, say, a year or two ago. Questions of the slogans and tactics of the struggle which could bring success under the changed conditions are being debated increasingly actively in the ranks of the antiwar movement. But not a single influential detachment of the antiwar movement has laid down its arms, abandoned the struggle and become reconciled to the presence of American nuclear missiles in Europe. "As persons who socially and professionally enjoy respect (doctors, ministers, generals, professors, politicians, clergymen) group around the peace movement to an increasingly great extent the arguments concerning the movement's isolation are absolutely not necessarily convincing. In fact it is thanks to the enormous and powerful potential of the peace movements, which is capable of elaborating alternative options of security policy and putting forward counterarguments to the opinion of the governments, that the governments have been forced to change their tone in respect of the peace movements. It is no longer possible to disregard the movements on account of the personality of their participants as such since prominent figures of the church and parliaments and other public figures have associated themselves with them."*

Just a few years ago even it was considered a big success if in Brussels, for example, 50,000 participants turned out for antiwar demonstrations, 150,000 in London and so forth. The peak of the demonstrations for peace and against the arms race were the mass demonstrations in the fall of 1983, which assembled in Bonn, Rome, London, The Hague and Brussels from 350,000 to 550,000 demonstrators. And how do things stand now? In the spring, summer and fall of 1984 the mass peace demonstrations, particularly in the countries where the new American missiles are being deployed, were far greater in terms of number of participants than the level of such protests in the "premissile" period. Some 600,000 FRG citizens took part in the spring peace marches. World Peace Day--1 September--and the United Nations' World Disarmament Week--in October 1984--were commemorated on a big scale in the country. More than 400,000 persons took part in mass demonstrations held under the slogans of an end to the arms race and the creation of new jobs. It is significant that the antiwar demonstrations were held not only in the major centers but also in a multitude of small localities, which reinforced the demonstrators' ranks with new categories of the population. More than 450,000 demonstrators took part in the Easter peace marches in the spring of 1985.

* E. Antola, Op. cit., pp 65-66.

The blockading of American military bases in Great Britain has been going on for a whole year. The culmination of Disarmament Action Week in the British Isles was a 20,000-strong demonstration against the Tridents in the port city of Barrow in Furness. In Italy more than 3.5 million persons put their signatures to an appeal for American cruise missiles to be removed from the base in Comiso. Some 350,000 French men and women took part in a Paris peace march on 28 October 1984 (150,000 had taken part in a similar march a year earlier).

There have been mass public demonstrations in Belgium, whose government, after vacillation and maneuvering, has after all subordinated itself to the diktat of the U.S. Administration and the NATO leadership, having adopted the decision to deploy the first consignment of American cruise missiles in March 1985. More than 150,000 persons came out onto the streets of Brussels on 17 March 1985 alone in accordance with the call of various organizations advocating peace and disarmament. Among those participating in the demonstration were leaders of the biggest political parties and members of parliament.

So, the hopes of the NATO countries' ruling circles that following the start of installation of the American nuclear missiles the population would become reconciled to their presence and that the antiwar movement, having failed to achieve the goal it had set--preventing their deployment--would subside have manifestly not been justified.

Analyzing the results of the antiwar protests of the fall of 1984, particularly in the FRG, the Belgian newspaper LE SOIR draws the following conclusion: "A year after the start of deployment of the Pershing 2's, the pacifist movement can count on an infrastructure that has been created on a national scale.... At a time when opinion polls are for the first time showing more than 10 percent of the electorate disposed to vote for the Greens (pacifists, protectors of the environment), the antiwar demonstrations have at least confirmed that in the FRG the spirit of pacifism is alive and well in broad strata of the population. This is so much the case that SPD Chairman W. Brandt unhesitatingly took part in a live chain organized by pacifists between Duisburg and Hasselbach."*

Endeavoring to pass off the wish for reality, Western mass media are impressing upon the public that a substantial proportion of the population is turning away from the antiwar movement and getting used to the deployment of the American missiles. But even opinion polls, which do not always concur in their results and which are largely contentious in respect of method, have shown that at the end of 1983 at least 76 percent of those polled were opposed to the deployment of the new American missiles in the FRG (40 percent in 1981), 62 percent in Italy, 48 percent in Britain and the overwhelming majority of those polled in Belgium and Holland. In mid-1981 the United States' information services conducted a confidential sounding of the public mood in Belgium and obtained the following result: 6 out of 10 Belgians were opposed to the deployment of Euromissiles on the territory of their country and in other West European states.

* LE SOIR, 23 October 1984.

It should be emphasized particularly that a whole number of political parties and mass public organizations which associated themselves with the actions of the antiwar movement in 1981-1983 officially confirmed their support for the peace protests in 1984 also. This was the case with the Social Democrats and Socialists in office in Sweden and Greece, the opposition British Labor Party and the West German Social Democrats and the main trade union centers of the FRG, Great Britain, Denmark and other countries. Describing the support expressed for the antiwar movement by SPD Chairman W. Brandt in his speech in the Bundestag on 12 September 1984, the French LE MONDE observed that "since the start of deployment of the American missiles in the FRG at the end of 1983 the SPD has rarely ranged itself so plainly on the side of the peace movement as on this occasion."* The West German Greens Party considers itself an integral part of the antiwar movement. Many of the West's influential religious circles also are maintaining their allegiance to the movement.

As is known, the Labor Party of Great Britain and the SPD, which constitute the main opposition force in their countries, opposed deployment of the American missiles with all certainty. The most pronounced evolution--and in a short time, moreover--was effected by the SPD, whose leadership, while in office, had been an initiator of NATO's "twin decision". The party's November (1983) congress voted by an overwhelming majority to change its previous orientation on this issue.

The mass peace movement has also had a direct impact on the main opposition forces in Belgium and the Netherlands, where the Flemish and francophone socialist parties (Belgium) and the Labor Party (Netherlands) are calling in parliament for a postponement of their countries' decision on the missile question and outside of parliament have supported the antiwar demonstrations of 1983-1985.

Of course, such a position is occupied by far from all of West Europe's social democratic and socialist parties. The Social Democrats and their international association--the Socialist International--have not yet done all that they really might to halt the arms race and return international relations to the channel of detente. Nonetheless, it would seem important that the majority of them is now advocating active dialogue with the USSR.

At a meeting with the Socialist International's Consultative Council on Disarmament on 22 March 1985 M.S. Gorbachev declared: "Considering their political authority and influence, the parties of the Socialist International could contribute to a large extent to an improvement in the international situation and a halt to the arms race and increase their contribution to the cause of delivering mankind from nuclear catastrophe."

Speaking at the opening of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building and Security Measures and Disarmament in Europe on 18 January 1984, A.A. Gromyko asserted with complete justification: "The peoples indignantly reject all

* LE MONDE, 14 September 1984.

concepts of nuclear war, and the plans for preparing and unleashing such are regarded as criminal." Criticism of the "nuclear deterrence" doctrines and first use of nuclear weapons is spreading increasingly not only in democratic circles of the West but also in spheres directly involved in political decision-making.

Influential circles of social democracy and also the Christian churches, including the Catholic Church, have undergone a considerable evolution in this sphere. The main propositions of the pastoral message of American Catholic bishops published in May 1983 had great repercussions. "We see no situation in which the premeditated unleashing of nuclear war, however limited, could be morally justified,"* declare the bishops of a country which was not only the first to use nuclear weapons but bases its strategy on first use thereof. The authors of the message call on the leaders of the United States and NATO to abandon the given concept. Bishops of the Catholic Church of the FRG, Belgium and Holland and the leadership of the Anglican Church have with a greater or lesser degree of certainty opposed the use of nuclear weapons.

The abandonment by influential social democratic circles and public forces close to them of the doctrine of "nuclear deterrence" which they once shared was manifested most distinctly in the results of the work of the Independent Commission for Disarmament and Security chaired by O. Palme. "Nuclear weapons are a monstrous instrument of war. Modern technology has changed both the probable nature and scale of possible consequences of modern warfare,"** the commission's report says. Its main idea--security for all--is called on, the authors believe, to come to replace the "nuclear deterrence" concept officially adopted by the United States and its allies.

The resolution on questions of a policy of peace and security adopted by the SPD congress which was held in May 1984 in Essen not only condemns the military doctrines of the United States and NATO which incorporate the idea of simultaneous strikes with nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons but also puts forward a new security concept presupposing a renunciation of "nuclear deterrence". "It is necessary to put an end to the trend toward the continued conversion of nuclear weapons into a means of warfare.... The buildup of military potentials entails not greater but less security for Europe.... An agreement on renunciation of the use of both nuclear and conventional force between the NATO and Warsaw Pact states should contain a clear renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons,"*** the resolution says.

The conference of Great Britain's Labor Party, which was held at the start of October 1984 in Blackpool, demanded the removal of all types of American nuclear weapons from British territory and its territorial waters. The Labor Party confirmed its adherence to a policy of Great Britain's renunciation of nuclear weapons.****

* Quoted from the French edition of the message "Les eveques americains disent non a la guerre nucleaire," Paris-Brussels, 1983.

** "Security for All. Program of Disarmament," Moscow, 1982, p 27.

*** SOZIALDEMOKRATISCHER PRESSEDIENST, 25 May 1984.

**** See THE TIMES, 4 October 1984.

A document of the West German Coordinating Committee of the FRG Peace Movement published in the summer of 1984 emphasized a distinctive feature of contemporary political life in the West: "The Peace Movement has broken down the wall of silence surrounding policy in the arms sphere and breached the so-called 'consensus on security policy'. Public opinion is no longer farming out questions of peace and security to so-called 'experts'."*

Faced with the capacity demonstrated by the antiwar movement for withstanding severe tests and blows, its opponents have gambled on splitting and disuniting the movement. It should be considered in this connection that the introduction to the struggle for peace and disarmament of representatives of various political currents and social groups, particularly those which until recently stood aloof from it, constitutes, of course, a strong aspect of the antiwar movement, but at the same time complicates the formulation of reference points, criteria and slogans common for the entire movement. After all, there is not among all its participants an identical view of the sources of the military danger, the causes of the exacerbation of international tension and the ways of removing it.

In the arsenal of weapons to which imperialist forces are resorting against the peace movement first place goes to attempts to appeal to the ideological standpoints of the participants who are not in sympathy with socialism and who are not fully aware that under current conditions lasting peace may be secured only on the firm foundation of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. An aspiration to "ideologize" the peace movement in their key may be discerned in the attempts to sow doubts within its ranks concerning the justice of the peaceful settlement of postwar European problems which has already been achieved and in the encouragement of the intentions of right and leftist elements to use the platform of nuclear disarmament in Europe to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist states.

The assertiveness of the enemies of peace, which is underpinned by substantial financial and other resources, is giving rise to a number of negative trends from the viewpoint of the tasks of the antiwar movement. There are persons and organizations deliberately pursuing a policy of splitting the movement, frequently taking cover here behind the slogan of the latter's "independence" of the influence of political parties, governments and states. Communists participating in the antiwar movement believe that it is so broad in its political and social composition that no political or ideological current has a right to advance claims to hegemony in it. Even less may different varieties of anticommunism and anti-Sovietism lay claim to this. But it is from precisely such circles that the splittist maneuvers are emanating.

A meeting of representatives of various antiwar organizations of the West under the name of "Third Convention for Europe's Nuclear Disarmament" was held in July 1984 in Perugia (Italy). Representatives of Soviet public

* "Stop Pershing II and Cruise Missiles. Call for a European Autumn of Peace '84," Bonn, 1984.

organizations did not participate in the first two such conventions: in one case they were not invited, in the other they were invited, but with provisos concerning "limited rights" compared with other participants. On the third occasion representatives of public organizations of the USSR and a number of other socialist countries did take part in the convention. Although there was a chance at this forum to conduct interesting and useful discussions with many participants in the peace struggle from Western countries, its organizers, among whom the tune was called by representatives of the so-called "European Nuclear Disarmament" and the "B. Russell Foundation," tried to demonstrate an entire arsenal of methods testifying to their desire to introduce to the peace movement a cold war spirit, counterpose to one another its different detachments operating in the West and in the East of the continent and to embroil organizations which have long been participating in the peace struggle, for decades, with those which were introduced to the movement comparatively recently. The latter chose as the point of departure here not only nonacceptance of the socialist system in a number of European countries as a historical reality (these things happen--not everyone in the West is in sympathy with socialism) but also a rejection of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. Such a position is all the more dangerous for the peace movement in that it conflicts with the postwar peaceful setup enshrined in a whole number of treaties and agreements and, finally, in the Helsinki Final Act.

It would seem at least odd that such views are being presented by people who declare their allegiance to the peace movement and even lay claim to a special, leading position therein. Thus in the document "Putting an End to the Occupation of Europe," which was disseminated at the Perugia Convention and which was signed by M. Kaldor (Great Britain) and M. Faber (Netherlands), an attempt is made to elaborate a certain alternative to the present system of security in Europe, which has ensured peace on our continent up to now and which is the result the smashing of fascism in WWII. M. Kaldor and M. Faber reduce the entire system of the USSR's equal and sovereign relations with the other socialist countries to the fraudulent formula of "occupation". "The postwar generation is in no way obliged to the liberators of the WWII period," the authors of the document proclaim their credo. In posing the issues thus they would like to impose on the antiwar movement as unquestionable dogma the proposition of the nonacceptance of socialist orders in a number of European countries and the "equal responsibility" of the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO for the increased danger of nuclear war. Are the authors of such concepts aware that their preaching is closely linked with the ideology of the "crusade" against socialism?

The representatives of the Soviet public at the Perugia Convention were guided, as, equally, at other forums also, primarily by concern to preserve the unity of the peace movement--despite the diversity of its constituent currents. In fact is it possible to agree on the scale of all Europe on the goals and priorities of the struggle to prevent nuclear war, bearing in mind that the conditions of the struggle for peace in this country or the other are so different and that persons sometimes adhering to opposite ideological and political beliefs participate in movements against the nuclear threat? We have believed and continue to believe this to be entirely possible if account is

taken of the general nature of the main demand--preserving Europe from a nuclear catastrophe, which would inevitably result in an end to civilization. People of different views who are aware of this danger may act jointly for the purpose of removing it if they regard the given task as the main task for the contemporary peace movement and do not aspire to subordinate it to some other aims from, say, the singularities of the world outlook of each of them.

Some people, in Perugia included, have put forward the following proposition. The nuclear threat to the world as a whole, particularly for Europe, emerged as the result of the rivalry of the two social and political systems which exist here. The nuclear arms race and also the present dangerous stage of nuclear confrontation are the result of these contradictions. Both sides, it is said, are to blame. And for this reason the peace movement should a priori have a feeling of distrust toward them, not investigating specifically precisely which forces are engendering a threat of war.

Such an approach, whereby the "incompatible is combined," hardly contributes to a unification of the broadest circles in the struggle for peace, without which the peace movement runs the risk of not accomplishing its crucial mission--saving mankind from annihilation in a nuclear conflagration. It is for this reason that the peace movement, in which there is room for people with different views and beliefs, only benefits if it concentrates on tackling mankind's common task.

The 40th anniversary of the Great Victory over fascism has reminded all peace-loving forces of the absolute necessity of their cohesion in the face of the main threat to mankind--then the fascist aggressor, now the danger of a nuclear catastrophe. The historic decisions of Yalta and Potsdam formed the basis of the peaceful democratic settlement in Europe and were enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act. These decisions erect a barrier in the way of those who still dream of revenge and who would like under the flag of a new "crusade" to revise the postwar territorial-political arrangement on our continent.

The attempts to put the peace movement on a platform hostile to Yalta, Potsdam and Helsinki are being rebuffed at numerous forums at which representatives of the most diverse political and public forces have met in recent years. The conferences for Europe's nuclear disarmament in Athens (February and December 1984), the session of the International Committee for European Security and Cooperation in Brussels (November 1984), the International Forum for Peace and Security in Europe (Brussels, March 1985) and, finally, the session of the WPC Presidium in Moscow 21-25 March 1985 confirmed this unifying trend. "May the year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism be a year of victory over the threat of nuclear war!" the Moscow session of the WPC Presidium proclaimed.

As already mentioned, attempts are being made to foist the concept of "equidistance" from the USSR and the United States on the antiwar movement. However, the groundlessness of this proposition is revealed upon the very first comparison of the positions of each power with the demands of the antiwar movement itself. This applies primarily to the problems of a halt to the arms

race and a freezing of nuclear arsenals, Europe's deliverance from nuclear weapons, the creation of nuclear-free zones on the continent, prevention of the militarization of space, Europe's deliverance from the threat of an outbreak of chemical warfare, the banning and destruction of chemical weapons altogether, prevention of a further race in so-called conventional arms, renunciation of all concepts of waging and "winning" aggressive wars and no first use of nuclear weapons.

These examples far from exhaust the list of concurrences of the USSR's position with the fundamental demands of the peace-loving forces, as, equally, the list of instances where the positions and specific acts of the U.S. Administration and its NATO allies are in howling contradiction with the hopes of millions of ordinary people and broad public circles. This fact will undoubtedly continue to influence with growing force the behavior of mass strata of the population of the capitalist countries in questions of foreign policy, however the West's ruling circles may attempt to disguise and distort the heart of the matter.

Increasingly broad strata of the international public are learning the truth about the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries and aspiring to increase interaction and cooperation in the struggle against the threat of nuclear war. The peoples emphatically refuse to live and build their security in accordance with American standards and prescriptions. As far as the ruling circles of the United States and the leaders of NATO are concerned, they fear most of all the wide-ranging debate on fundamental issues of security policy increasing the chances of the peace movement in its confrontation with militarist forces. The world public sees in the consistent course of the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy a real opportunity for an improvement in the international situation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, U.S. MILITARY POLICY IN PACIFIC VIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 48-58

[Article by Yu. Stolyarov and A. Shmyrev: "The Pacific in the Strategy of Imperialism"]

[Excerpts] Since the time of the industrial revolution of the 18th century the West European countries were the center of the development of capitalism's production forces and its main political arena. By the end of the 19th century the club of the leading imperialist powers had been joined by the United States. Competition and rivalry, which periodically developed into military clashes, have predominated in the relations between these states situated on both sides of the Atlantic.

As far as the Pacific is concerned, Japan's role here began to grow increasingly noticeably as of the turn of the century. Although at the start of our century it was still not possible to speak of this area as an independent zone of capitalism's intensive economic assertiveness, even then there were relatively developed trading relations between its individual countries (Japan--United States, Japan--China). At the same time interimperialist contradictions, which ultimately led in 1941 to Japan's war with the United States and the other leading imperialist powers, reached great intensity in the region.

After WWII the United States, availing itself of its tremendous economic and military superiority, imposed the concept of "Atlantism" or "Atlantic solidarity," which was practically embodied in the creation and activity of the aggressive NATO bloc, on a number of West European countries. The "Atlantic" direction became the leading direction in American imperialism's global strategy. The basic economic potential of the capitalist world and its main foreign trade, technology and currency flows were concentrated in the Atlantic zone. The concentration of the economic and political power of capitalism in the region grew even more with the formation of the EEC.

The United States was also able to establish essentially undivided sway in the nonsocialist part of the Pacific. Occupied by American troops, Japan was removed as an economic and political rival. The positions of the West European powers, primarily Britain and France, had been seriously undermined. However, as a consequence of the uneven development of capitalist states in the era of

imperialism in the 1960's even Japan again began to move to the fore. The economic growth rate in the ASEAN countries and also in South Korea, Hong Kong (Xianggang) and Taiwan (it has amounted to an average annual level of 7-10 percent) has been growing as of the 1970's. Australia and New Zealand have developed quite rapidly in the postwar period. As a result the relative significance of the Pacific in the world capitalist economy has increased markedly.

It should be emphasized here that the development of the said states and territories has acquired a mutually complementary nature. The decisive role originally was performed by the superiority of American and then Japanese capital, which imposed on these countries an economic growth model which was profitable for itself. Despite the serious discords, close trade-economic relations took shape between the United States and Japan themselves. The process of internationalization of economic life, which was accelerated by the unfolding of the latest twist of the spiral of the scientific-technical revolution, began to gather pace rapidly in the region. As a result a new zone of the economic assertiveness of contemporary capitalism--the countries and territories of the Pacific--was showing distinctly by the latter half of the 1960's. This prompted the ruling circles of the United States to pay increased attention to the Pacific direction of their global strategy.

Wide-ranging studies on Pacific subject matter developed in academic circles of the United States, Japan, Australia and other capitalist countries. They drew conclusions concerning a shift of the economic and subsequently political center of capitalism toward the Pacific and predicted at every step the onset in the next century of a "Pacific age".*

An understanding of the singularities of the trend in question and its dynamics is extraordinarily important for an evaluation of the development prospects of present-day capitalism and its contradictions and potential, from the viewpoint also of its assimilation and enlistment in its orbit of areas which were previously on the periphery. The United States is putting its hopes in a strengthening of capitalism's global positions thanks to the countries and territories of the Pacific and a broadening of the possibilities of its own maneuvering in relations with West Europe and Japan. The latter also intends strengthening even further its, primarily economic, positions in the region and in fact converting it into a kind of continuation of the Japanese economy. This, as Japan calculates, will enable it to increase its authority in the international arena as a whole and bring the country's political potential into line with its economic role in the world. Finally, the Pacific is being turned by the United States--in close interaction with Japan--into one further area of the global confrontation with world socialism and into a second, eastern, front of the struggle against the USSR. As the Japanese newspaper TOKYO SHIMBUN observed, "Washington believes that the decisive clash with communism and the Soviet Union in all spheres will shift to the Pacific."

* For more detail see "Pacific Regionalism: Concepts and Reality," Moscow, 1983.

The Pacific countries account for over 55 percent of the capitalist world's total industrial production.* They occupy leading positions in the manufacture of a whole number of most important types of finished product.** The aggregate GNP of the five leading states of the region (United States, Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) is roughly 1.7 times greater than the analogous indicator of the Common Market.

Major shifts are occurring within the region in the location of the production forces. They testify to the increasingly great orientation of the Pacific countries' industrial toward the development of reciprocal exchange and the growing mutual complementariness of the sectors of their industry.

The economic potential of the Pacific states of the United States, where big cities and the most modern production processes are concentrated (the Los Angeles--San Francisco megalopolis--the biggest in the United States), is developing at an accelerated pace. Approximately two-thirds of the country's population lives and more than 80 percent of its industrial product is produced in Japan's so-called Pacific zone, that is, mainly on the territory between Tokyo and Osaka. Similar processes are occurring in Canada, Australia, Indonesia and South Korea.

A most important role in the process of internationalization of economic life in the Pacific is performed by the intensive export of capital, primarily from the United States and Japan. Their investments in certain countries and sectors of the economy shape the intraregional structure of the division of labor to a decisive extent. States and territories of the Pacific account for 14.2 percent of the direct overseas capital investments of the United States (1983, excluding Canada) and 61.4 percent of Japan (1984).

The main direction of their influence on the regional division of labor appears in the following form. The American transnational corporations and, to a lesser extent, the Japanese make direct investments in the mining industry of Australia, which has become one of the biggest raw material suppliers in the capitalist world. Australian coal, iron ore, bauxites and other types of industrial raw material are supplied primarily to Japan, where based on advanced technology designed for the manufacture of standard large-series output rolled ferrous and nonferrous metals, automobiles, ships, home

* Estimated from "Main Economic Indicators," "Monthly Bulletin of Statistics," MEMO No 8, supplement for 1984. Here and subsequently, if not stipulated otherwise, the calculations have been made for the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Oceania, the ASEAN countries, South Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan.

** At the start of the 1980's they were producing 55.8 percent of the automobiles, approximately 70 percent of the ships, 61.2 percent of synthetic fibers, 73.3 percent of radio receivers and 49.7 percent of television receivers, 46.2 percent of aluminum, 30.5 percent of cement, 37.6 percent of the steel and so forth ("PBEC Statistics," Tokyo, 1982, pp 70-115).

electrical engineering products and so forth are produced in the biggest quantities in the capitalist world. These products are subsequently exported to the United States, Australia, Canada, the ASEAN countries and other Pacific states and territories.

In this structure of the regional division of labor the predominant position was until recent years occupied by the United States, which left Japan, Australia and certain developing countries the "lower" and "middle" stories of the production engineering chain. Currently the Japanese monopolies are actively squeezing out the American competitors, increasing the exports of science-intensive and technically intricate products. Simultaneously the "middle" story is being passed on to a number of developing states and territories linked primarily to the Japanese economy.

The main direction of economic and political development in the region is determined by the most developed countries, primarily the United States and Japan. Under current conditions, despite the existence of serious trade-economic contradictions, the basic content of their relations is shaped by factors operating in a centripetal direction. At the same time an opposite trend connected with the continued exacerbation of their rivalry could gather pace also. After all, even today Japan has practically become the leading economic force of the region and is squeezing the United States on local markets. To what extent Washington will tolerate this situation time will tell.

II

Despite the strengthening of Japan's economic positions, the United States continues to exert the predominant influence on the military-political situation in the Pacific. Here, as in the Atlantic also, Washington adheres to bloc diplomacy aimed primarily against the socialist forces. However, for a number of reasons it has not managed to create in the Pacific a monolithic military-political grouping of the NATO type. A system of bilateral and multilateral military-political agreements under the aegis of the United States, which has such agreements with Japan, the Philippines and South Korea, operates in the region. As far as multilateral blocs are concerned, one of them (SEATO) has ceased to exist, while the activity of the others has either been paralyzed (ASPAC) or is encountering great difficulties (ANZUS).

The United States' defeat in the aggressive war against the peoples of the Indochina peninsula, the strengthening of the forces of socialism in the region, the collapse of a number of blocs of a pro-American orientation and also the strengthening here of neutralist trends forces Washington to make very considerable adjustments to its Pacific policy. As of the 1980's the United States has embarked on a plan-based buildup of armed forces in the region, a strengthening of the chain of bases and strong points and the deployment of new types of weapons. These actions of Washington have been brought about not only by military-strategic considerations but also the increased significance of this region of the world from the viewpoint of the economic interests of American imperialism.

Under current conditions the second biggest grouping in terms of numbers of U.S. armed forces overseas, which incorporates approximately 150,000 servicemen, is deployed in the Pacific. It is proposed increasing in 1985 the number of Trident-type nuclear strike submarines to 13. The 7th Fleet, which is deployed in the region, has been given the latest aircraft carrier, the "Carl Vinson," and the battleship "New Jersey". Pershing 2 missiles have been deployed in South Korea. Tomahawk cruise missiles with nuclear warheads have been installed on ships of the 7th Fleet. The deployment of the latest F-16 fighter bombers, which are capable of delivering nuclear weapons a distance of up to 1,000 kilometers, has begun at the American air base at Misawa (Japan). Thus in the Far East also the United States is bringing first-strike weapons as close to the USSR's borders as possible. To judge by everything, Washington is endeavoring to break up the military-strategic situation which has taken shape in the region and convert it into a most important theater of military confrontation with socialism together with West Europe.

For realization of the above-mentioned plans the existing bilateral and multilateral treaties are not good enough for the United States. In this connection Washington has embarked actively on knocking together a new military-political grouping in the Pacific, in which a special role is assigned Japan and South Korea.

Throughout recent decades Japan has figured as the main strong point in the Pacific in the United States' military-strategic and foreign policy plans. The U.S. Administration's new demands in the military sphere are enjoying a favorable response in Japanese ruling circles inasmuch as this corresponds to their intention to pass beyond the framework of the bilateral Japanese-American alliance and embark on the pursuit of more active diplomacy in Asia and the Pacific. The Japanese Government has readily agreed to occupy the position of equal military ally of the United States and be incorporated in the uniform strategic system of the West. For this reason it has accepted the Reagan administration's proposal that the relations of the two countries be defined as "allied". This term was first used in the joint communique on the results of the talks between Prime Minister Z. Suzuki and R. Reagan in May 1981.

The transition to "allied relations" has required of the Japanese side the assumption of more substantial military commitments than those provided for by the 1960 "Security Treaty". Proceeding from the above-mentioned communique, it has undertaken "to make an increasingly big effort to strengthen its defense potential on Japanese territory and also in the seas and airspace surrounding Japan."* It soon transpired what was concealed by this wording. Suzuki bound the country by an undertaking to prepare to patrol in the immediate future the seas and airspace to a distance of up to 1,000 nautical miles from its shores. The zone of possible operations of the "Self-Defense Force" was thereby expanded appreciably. In fact this means an outright abandonment of the "Self-Defense Force's" declared defensive functions and is leading to its conversion into a major army of a state which has been pulled into the system

* ASAHI SHIMBUN, 10 May 1981.

of aggressive blocs created by the United States. It is not surprising that this step has been accompanied by a stimulation of Japan's ties to NATO and also efforts to cobble together in conjunction with Washington a new military bloc in the Far East.

The process of the rapprochement of Japan, the United States and NATO was speeded up even more following Y. Nakasone's assumption of office. His words: "All the Japanese islands should be reminiscent of an unsinkable aircraft carrier" have become widely known. This was his first proclaimed goal. "The second," Nakasone went on to say, "should consist of complete control over the four straits washing the Japanese islands to ensure that Soviet submarines and other ships not pass through them.* The third goal consists of securing and maintaining sea lanes. Our ocean defenses should stretch several hundred miles, and if it is a question of shipping routes, I would like us to defend the shipping routes between Guam and Tokyo and between the Taiwan Strait and Osaka."**

Nakasone's pronouncement was perceived in Japan, the United States and the Southeast Asian countries as clear evidence of Tokyo's intention to have done with the vestiges of the ostentatious love of peace and associate itself fully with the military strategy of Washington with the status of equal ally.

At the same time the proclamation by the head of the Japanese Government of an avowedly militarist program reflected Japan's intention to lay claim to leadership if not on a global, then on a regional scale. This was confirmed particularly forcefully at the meeting of leaders of the seven leading capitalist countries which was held in May 1983 in Williamsburg. It was precisely on Nakasone's initiative that the following sentence was inserted in the statement of the meeting: "The security of our countries is indivisible, and this question should be approached from global standpoints." Thus for the first time Japan's militarist efforts are openly linked with NATO activity.***

The annual meetings of the "seven" have become both for Japan and the leading NATO powers also a convenient form of coordination of their policy. The degree of coordination has reached such a level that in London Nakasone discussed with Reagan the general military plans of the West, including the possibility of imperialism's intervention in the Persian Gulf.

The readiness displayed by the Nakasone government to play a paramount part in the West's global strategy has enabled the United States to turn fully to realization of the plan for the creation of a new military-political bloc in the Pacific--the Washington--Tokyo--Seoul "axis".

The main feature of the United States' efforts in this direction was the urging of Japan and South Korea toward rapprochement--political, military and economic. In addition, the United States is actively strengthening South Korea's army and its own military presence here. Back in 1969 the joint communique following top-level Japanese-American negotiations for the first time linked

* It is customary to divide the Korea Strait into two, between which are the Tsushima Islands.

** THE WASHINGTON POST, 19 January 1983.

*** ASAHI SHIMBUN, 31 May 1983.

Japan's security with the existence of the Seoul regime. It is well known that not without overseas pressure in the 1970's Japan even discussed the possibility of the dispatch of the "Self-Defense Force" to South Korea in the event of major disturbances. It is significant that in 1979 the journal JIYU MINSUTO, the organ of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party, carried an article whose author urged a military alliance of Japan, the United States and South Korea. The article contained an appeal to the navies of Japan and South Korea to assume within the framework of this alliance the mission of confronting the Soviet Navy in the Korea Strait--the same mission which Prime Minister Nakasone subsequently set the Japanese Navy.*

It may be said that with the Nakasone government's assumption of office Japanese-South Korean relations have essentially become allied. In January 1983 the Japanese prime minister paid a visit to Seoul, which was the first official trip to South Korea by a Japanese head of government. The Japanese prime minister then headed for the United States, where questions of relations between Japan and South Korea were discussed also. The nature of the talks, to judge by press reports, permits the conclusion that the sides touched here on problems of the military cooperation of Japan and South Korea.

The second round of top-level Japanese-South Korean negotiations in September 1984 in Tokyo confirmed that the main point on their agenda was military cooperation. Chun Doo Hwan was accompanied by Gen (Li Ki Pek), chairman of the South Korean Army Chiefs of Staff Committee, who had talks with his colleague, the Japanese General Watanabe. Less than a month later they were continued in Seoul, where Watanabe also met with the American Gen W. Livsey, commander of the joint American-South Korean Armed Forces.

Japan is rendering South Korea very considerable political and economic support. To please the Seoul regime the Japanese Government constantly demonstrates a stubborn unwillingness to have contacts at official level with the DPRK. It is significant that the DPRK is the sole country in the world from which Japan withholds diplomatic recognition. The Japanese Government stands in the way of an exchange of delegations between the two states and so forth. Not only political but also economic "sanctions" are applied in respect of the DPRK.

To support the South Korean economy Tokyo granted the Seoul regime \$4.4 billion from 1966 through 1981 and agreed to allocate a further \$4 billion in January 1983. Seoul does not conceal the fact that to a considerable extent the loans are being spent on needs of the South Korean Army also. All this is connected with the special role assigned the antipopular Chun Doo Hwan regime in imperialism's Pacific strategy.

South Korea has long occupied an important place in the Pentagon's plans. There are approximately 40 American bases on its territory at which 40,000 U.S. servicemen, more than 1,000 nuclear weapons, the latest aircraft, medium-range missiles and so forth are deployed. The South Korean Army is one of the biggest in Asia, numbering 650,000 men.

* "Japan-1980," Moscow, 1981, p 292.

Powerful impetus to the formation of the trilateral military alliance of Washington, Tokyo and Seoul was the visit to Japan and South Korea in November 1983 by President R. Reagan. The Washington--Tokyo--Seoul "axis" is thus becoming a reality, an actual military-political bloc aimed mainly against the forces of socialism. The military functions of this bloc are catered for primarily by the United States and South Korea, the economic functions by all-around Japanese assistance to the Seoul regime.

To strengthen their positions in the Pacific and put pressure on the socialist countries the United States and Japan have stepped up the realization of plans to form the so-called "Pacific community". In the practical plane the idea for its creation was put forward in 1979 by Japanese Prime Minister M. Ohira.* The main emphasis was at that time put on the development of economic and cultural cooperation in the region. Then in 1982 this idea was specified in altered form by Z. Suzuki. In his concept the "Pacific community" appeared as an organization of states oriented toward implementation of goals profitable primarily to the United States--in politics--and to Japan--in economics.

Under current conditions a further elaboration of the "Pacific community" concept, which acquired new impetus during the negotiations between Reagan and Nakasone in January 1985 and in the course of the Japanese prime minister's subsequent meetings with leaders of a number of countries of the region, is under way. The United States, which for a certain time displayed a certain restraint on this question, has actively joined in expediting the realization of the plans for the creation of a community in practice. Its current American-Japanese version contains the following principles: 1) Pacific cooperation to be confined to the economic, scientific-technical and cultural spheres; 2) the ASEAN states to play an important part; 3) cooperation to be based on private sector initiatives; 4) it will not be of an exclusive nature, countries of other regions may participate.

Pronounced changes have been made compared with the proposals which were advanced earlier. There is considerably increased emphasis on the leading role of the private sector. The significance of the ASEAN countries has been enhanced and certain of their wishes taken into consideration in order to remove the objections which existed previously. Both Japan and the United States are deliberately avoiding touching on military-political aspects. The expanded interpretation of the community makes it possible, if necessary, to include therein capitalist countries situated in other parts of the world also.

Some of the proposals which have been put forward have already been given the corresponding base. Thus the proposition concerning the leading role of the private sector in the development of regional cooperation is being realized in practice through the Pacific Economic Council, which was set up in 1967 and which is the permanent information and consultative body of the private companies and banks of the countries of the region. In the 1970's the United States,

* For more detail see MEMO No 3, 1981; PROBLEMY DAL'NEGO VOSTOKA No 2, 1983.

Japan, Australia and New Zealand established a system of permanent consultations with ASEAN on a broad range of issues. The current version of the concept of the formation of the community takes account of this grouping's wish for the cooperation mechanism within its framework to be based on the decisions of enlarged conferences of the association's foreign ministers with the enlistment of the heads of the foreign policy departments of the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Pacific trade and development conferences have been held since the end of the 1960's with the support of Japan's Foreign Ministry. The Pacific Cooperation Committee, which coordinates the work of five working groups on regional problems, the exchange of information and so forth, has been functioning since 1980. The Pacific Democratic Union, which unites conservative forces of the developed capitalist states of the region, was set up in 1982 to encourage contacts in the political sphere. It incorporates Japan's Liberal-Democratic Party, the Australian Liberal Party, New Zealand's National Party and Canada's Progressive Conservative Party. The U.S. Republican Party participates as an observer.

Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone has said repeatedly that emphasis in the community will be put on the development of trade, financial and cultural cooperation. It will allegedly not involve itself in military cooperation. As far as the U.S. position is concerned, it was expounded more candidly by R. Reagan's former National Security Adviser R. Allen: "It would be desirable for the countries of this region to be united in the same way as the United States and West Europe."* These words contain a clear hint of the "NATO-ization" of the Pacific.

Thus by the efforts of the United States, Japan and their allies the Pacific is becoming one more zone of confrontation with the USSR and the other socialist countries. The buildup of the U.S. military presence in the region and the intensification of Japan's military preparations and the stimulation of the activity of the Washington--Tokyo--Seoul "axis" testify to this. The question of the creation of a new grouping in the Pacific--the "Pacific community"--has been put on the agenda.

However, not everything is proceeding as the instigators of the spurring of tension in the region would like. The position of the ASEAN members in respect of the community is far from synonymous. Some of them continue to be guarded concerning participation therein. The ANZUS bloc has been deeply riven as a result of the New Zealand Government's decision not to allow calls at its ports by foreign ships which carry nuclear weapons or which are nuclear-powered. An active antinuclear position is occupied by a number of small states of the South Pacific.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it has repeatedly condemned any kind of militarist axes, triangles and other blocs. The USSR is emphatically opposed to every conceivable "sphere of influence" and "interests zone" and exclusive military-political groupings in the Pacific. The Soviet Union believes that the Pacific belongs to everybody--it can and must become an ocean of peace and good-neighborliness.

* MAINICHI SHIMBUN, 25 December 1984.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

AUSTRIAN NEUTRALITY, TRADE WITH USSR DISCUSSED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 108-114

[Article by M. Yasovskaya: "Firm Foundation of Soviet-Austrian Cooperation"]

[Excerpt] Observance of neutrality status presupposes that Austria will remain neutral in wars which could break out in the future. This also means that even in peacetime it will not join any military alliance in order in the event of the outbreak of a military conflict between other states not to be forced to violate the general provisions of international law and the rules of neutrality set forth in the Hague Convention of 18 October 1907.

Furthermore, neutral states may not permit use of their territory by belligerents or give the latter any support (supplies of military materials, the granting of loans for military needs and so forth). For this reason Austria must pursue its foreign policy such as not to find itself pulled into a war. At the same time it is obliged--and permanent neutrality status stipulates such a provision--to defend its neutrality by all means at its disposal.

In the book "The Austrian Way," which is devoted to foreign policy problems, former UN Secretary General K. Waldheim wrote: "Looking back, it may be said that the decision to accept permanent neutrality status was the correct one. It has brought Austria not only political and economic stability but also international recognition which the Alpine republic had never enjoyed hitherto." He noted also that "geography, history and politics were concerned" for neutrality. "Austria is situated at the heart of Central Europe. It is the shortest route for the contacts of the six countries bordering it and, consequently, for many contiguous states also."*

The State Treaty governing the restoration of an independent and democratic Austria and the permanent neutrality status based thereon, which correspond to the people's fundamental interests, have played an important part not only in the restoration and development of the national economy. These two documents are also of international importance. They have contributed and continue to contribute to the preservation and strengthening of peace on the European continent and the expansion of the all-around cooperation of states with different social systems.

* K. Waldheim, "The Austrian Way," Moscow, 1976, pp 18, 14.

The past 30 years have confirmed as convincingly as can be Austria's positive contribution to the settlement of international conflicts, the pursuit of a policy of relaxation of West East-West tension and a readiness to develop friendly relations with all countries. An active position on many urgent problems of the present day is actually embodied in Austria's participation in the United Nations and its organizations.

The Austrian Republic supported the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and made a constructive contribution to its work. While abiding by the policy of permanent neutrality it participated actively in the formulation of the final document of the Madrid meeting and preparation of the Stockholm conference. Emphasizing the international significance of the State Treaty, B. Kreisky observed that it "initiated the policy of detente. Neutral Austria has been a graphic example of peaceful coexistence. The normalization of relations between different political and social systems on whose borders Austria is situated was an essential prerequisite for detente in Europe. In this sense the All-European Conference in Helsinki is directly linked with the State Treaty."

Reality has proven as convincingly as can be the soundness of the course adopted 30 years ago. Today the Austrian capital is a major center of international relations. More than 40 international organizations avail themselves of its hospitality. The talks on a mutual reduction in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe are being conducted in Vienna's Hofburg Palace. International conferences, congresses and negotiations are conducted and politicians and diplomats and scientists and representatives of business circles of states with different social systems meet in Vienna. The UN International Center, which was built at the end of the 1970's and which houses the IAEA, UNIDO, OPEC and others, is located here. There are also offices of more than 200 nongovernmental organizations in Vienna.

Soviet-Austrian cooperation in the most diverse spheres is strengthening and expanding on the firm basis of the State Treaty and Austria's chosen permanent neutrality status. Statesmen's negotiations and the exchange of opinions on questions of bilateral relations and international problems are becoming more regular. This tradition has been confirmed in recent years by official visits by N.A. Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers (April 1981), and a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to Austria (October 1984) and of R. Kirschlaeger, federal president of the Austrian Republic (May 1982), and Federal Chancellor F. Sinowatz (November 1984) to the Soviet Union. "The essence of our relations," Austrian Foreign Minister L. Gratz observed on the eve of this visit, "is that throughout the almost 30 years since the signing of the State Treaty they have improved step by step from year to year."

A wealth of experience of economic cooperation has been accumulated in the two countries' relations. Austria is one of the USSR's main trading partners among the Western countries. Its share of Soviet commodity turnover with capitalist countries almost doubled in the 1970's and by the start of the 1980's had reached approximately 4 percent. The USSR accounts for almost 5 percent of Austrian commodity turnover (3.5 percent of exports and 51. percent of imports). For Austria the Soviet Union is the fourth biggest sales market. The 1970's were marked by an upsurge of economic cooperation. Foreign trade

turnover, which occupies the main place in economic relations, increased appreciably. From 1970 through 1984 it grew more than 10-fold and reached the record level of R1.7 billion.

The structure of foreign trade, albeit characterized by a certain asymmetry of commodity flows, is highly diverse. The main Soviet export item is energy raw material, mainly natural gas, oil and petroleum products and solid fuel. Automobiles, metal-cutting machine tools, forging-pressing equipment, bearings, instruments and other products are exported also. The USSR exports iron ore, cotton, pig iron, ferroalloys, chemical products and also consumer goods. Soviet refrigerators, carpets, furs and cameras are well known on the Austrian market.

Austria depends to a considerable extent on energy raw material imports. In the 1970's they covered 72-75 percent of total energy needs compared with 64 percent in 1970. According to specialists' estimates, by the end of the 1980's this indicator will have risen to 80 percent. The Soviet Union supplies a considerable proportion of essential natural gas and crude. It is well known that Austria was the first West European country to purchase Soviet natural gas back in 1968. Since then it has received over 27 billion cubic meters of gas.*

Many products of Austrian industry enjoy deserved success on the Soviet market thanks to their high quality and technical specifications. The USSR's foreign trade organizations purchase forging-pressing equipment, metal-cutting machine tools, river boats of various types and equipment for the textile, chemical, timber, wood-processing and certain other sectors of industry.

There has been an appreciable increase in recent years in the proportion of metal products and semimanufactures, including rolled ferrous metals, pipes, telephone cable and structural steel plate. Austria also exports chemical products--varnishes and paints and industrial consumer goods.

A number of Austrian firms has long experience of cooperation with Soviet organizations and enterprises, in such progressive forms as scientific-technical relations and industrial joint labor included. Among the contracting parties are the biggest state companies and also small and medium-sized companies. The fulfillment of Soviet orders enables them to improve their production indicators, expand marketing possibilities and increase employment. As a whole, over 500 Austrian firms are cooperating with the Soviet Union.

Long-standing and fruitful contacts have been established between the USSR and Voest-Alpine, Austria's biggest state concern, which manufactures high-grade steel and rolled products, metal structures and pipes, machines and machine tools and diesel boats and barges. Over 30 percent of its products are exported to the socialist countries, including the Soviet Union, which, for example, in 1982 alone purchased one-tenth of the concern's total export products.

* VNESHNYAYA TORGOVLYA No 1, 1983, p 38.

Trade with the Soviet Union is of great significance for Austria's ship-building industry and, in particular, for the leading Oesterreichische Schiffswerften Linz-Kornoburg company. The Heid engineering firm began to supply products to the USSR 60 years ago. At that time they were simple agricultural machines, now it exports intricate machine tools with digital program control. The company also acquires Soviet machines--a processing center from Ivanovo and machine tools from Minsk and Ulyanovsk. The reciprocal supplies are supplemented by joint developments.

Almost 40 years have elapsed since the conclusion of the first contract with the USSR of the Siemens-Oesterreich major electrical engineering company, which is widely known not only in its country but also abroad. It manufactures power and telephone cables, telephone apparatus and electro-acoustic equipment which has been installed in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, the Bolshoy Theater and the "Melodiya" firm. Almost one-fourth of the company's entire exported product goes to the CEMA countries, and the bulk, moreover, to the USSR.*

As of the latter half of the 1970's Austrian Government and business circles have been making vigorous efforts aimed at achieving balanced exchange. The selection of products has been broadened considerably, and the possibilities and requirements of the Soviet market are being studied more attentively. This enabled Austria to more than halve the deficit in 1982 and to achieve a surplus balance of trade in 1983.

A particular place in the expansion of mutually profitable economic relations belongs to the agreement on the basic conditions of Soviet natural gas supplies which was signed in June 1982 between the "Soyuzgazekспорт" All-Union Association and the Austrian Petroleum Agency. In accordance with this, over a period of 25 years, beginning 1984, the USSR will export 1.5 billion cubic meters of gas annually. Imports may be increased by a further 1 billion cubic meters if the customer wishes.

In March 1982 the Voest-Alpine company concluded a major contract with the "Metallurgimport" All-Union Association for the "turnkey" construction in the city of Zhlobin of a foundry for the production of 500,000 tons of rolled products and 200,000 tons of blanks a year. The foundry was commissioned in November 1984. Electronic control systems developed by the Siemens-Oesterreich firm, which have been employed successfully for a number of years now at the Novolipetsk Foundry, are used extensively in its shops. This was the first time in the practice of economic cooperation between the countries that an Austrian firm has constructed such a major "turnkey" industrial facility in the USSR.**

Industrial joint labor, in the manufacture of automobile tires and soles for footwear from polyurethane and the production and marketing of hoisting-shaft

* PRAVDA, 12 March 1983.

** VNESHNYAYA TORGOVLYA No 1, 1983, p 39.

and machine-tool equipment included, is developing in a number of sectors. The creation of a new model of a lathe with digital program control by Ryazan tool builders and their partners from the Austrian Heid firm serves as an example of such joint labor. Another example is the development of modern truck-welding units. Designed by the Arc Welding Institute imeni Ye.O. Paton (Kiev) and manufactured at Ukrainian enterprises, the track-welding heads are assembled in the assembly shop of the main plant of the Austrian Plasser und Teurer company in the track-welding machines which are built here, which are then sold abroad.

Economic cooperation has been organized between Soviet organizations and Austrian firms in the 1980's in the construction of industrial facilities on the territory of third countries. Thus the "Atomenergoeksport" All-Union Association enlisted the Austrian Tranex, Scholler Farma and Austroschrift firms in the construction of the ("Tazhura") Nuclear Research Center in Libya. They fitted out the infrastructure of the computer center and supplied the visual information means.

The total volume of cooperation on the markets of third countries increased from 70,000 Schillings in 1978 to approximately 300 million Schillings in 1982. The possibilities of Austrian companies' participation in the Soviet Union's installation of foundries in Libya, Turkey and other countries, a hydropower station in Argentina, railroads and a nuclear power station in Libya and also industrial facilities in Vietnam, Iraq, Colombia and other states are being discussed.

Scientific-technical cooperation has been further developed in the 1980's. There has been a marked increase in the volume of relations in the sphere of both the fundamental and applied sciences, and there has been an expansion of their subject matter. These include the exchange of scientific-technical information and documents, the organization of symposia, seminars and technical exhibitions, joint experiments and the testing of samples of raw material and new types of products. Scientific-technical contacts are maintained most actively in metallurgy, engineering, chemistry and other sectors of industry and agriculture.

For example, technology for obtaining steel with steadily low silicon, nitrogen, sulfur and phosphorus content has been developed in conjunction with the Voest-Alpine concern, which makes it possible to increase its quality considerably. Using aromatizers of the "Dragoko" firm, products in the confectionary and perfumery-cosmetics industry are manufactured on the basis of Soviet raw material also.

The USSR's business contacts with the Plasser und Teurer company, which began at the end of the 1960's with the purchase of individual types of equipment for the construction and maintenance of railroad track, were supplemented in the 1970's by cooperation in the sphere of science and technology. More than 250 composite track machines have already been built in Kaluga in accordance with licenses acquired from the firm. And they have been designed, furthermore, such that they can operate in a complex and interaction with the railroad equipment employed in the Soviet Union. This opens new possibilities of cooperation in the future.*

* PRAVDA, 23 October 1983.

The Committee for Relations Between the USSR Commercial-Industrial Chamber and the Austrian Federal Chamber of Economics will broaden its activity in the 1980's. It contributes to a stimulation of information exchange, reciprocal visits of representatives of business circles, exhibition work and the organization of scientific seminars and symposia. Thus in 1981 the committee prepared and held in Moscow the symposium and exhibition "Modern Technology of Austria". In March 1983 Moscow and Kiev were visited by delegations of Styrian business circles headed by G. Fuchs, minister of economics of this state. It (sic) consisted of representatives of 18 firms specializing in the production of equipment for agriculture and chemical and light industry.

The "Business Meetings Festival," which was run by the USSR Commercial-Industrial Chamber office in conjunction with the USSR trade delegation in Austria, was conducted successfully in Linz. More than 35 small and medium-sized companies took part.

Visits of the scientists, delegations and industrial trainees are continuing in accordance with an agreement between the academies of sciences of the USSR and the Austrian Republic (1971). Both countries regularly exchange scientific information. Particularly close scientific-technical contacts are maintained by the Austrian Voest-Alpine, Hemi-Linz and Oesterreichische Schiffswerften Linz-Kornoburg state companies. The USSR State Committee for Science and Technology in conjunction with ministries and departments has permanent business relations with more than 50 Austrian firms, and long-term agreements on scientific-technical cooperation have been concluded with 16 of them.*

An agreement on cooperation in the sphere of the legal protection of industrial ownership came into force in January 1982. It provides for the settlement of questions connected with the legal protection of joint inventions, industrial samples, trademarks and other industrial products created as a result of scientific-technical cooperation.

The Food Program being implemented in the USSR has afforded new opportunities for cooperation in the sphere of agriculture and the sectors related to it, in engineering and chemistry, for example. A symposium on selection technology with a demonstration of machinery in operation was conducted in 1982 in Odessa on the base of the All-Union Selection-Genetic Institute with the participation of Austrian firms.

In March 1983 there was a seminar on problems of hill farming and small-sized equipment for cultivating mountain slopes, in which 10 Austrian firms took part. The "Agro-Food Technology of Austria," which was held September-October 1983 in Moscow, evoked great interest in Soviet specialists. The representatives of 50 Austrian companies delivered over 60 papers on agricultural equipment and also technology and equipment for food industry.

* VNESHNYAYA TORGOVLYA No 2, 1984, p 31.

The long-term agreement on the terms of the granting of credit for supplies from Austria to the USSR, which was concluded in March 1980, contributes to the extension of economic relations. It is of great significance for enhancing the competitiveness of Austrian commodities on the Soviet market. Large-scale contracts have already been concluded for the supply to our country of complete-set equipment for the annual manufacture of 6 million eyeglass frames, machinery for the annual manufacture of 160 tons of paper, 800,000 tons of pipes of the petroleum product range and individual types of chemical equipment and also 10 dry-cargo motorship-pusher tugs and 3 river passenger motorships.*

The Long-Term Program of the Development and Extension of Economic, Scientific-Technical and Industrial Cooperation Between the USSR and Austria in 1981-1990 was adopted in January 1981 in Moscow. It is based on an extension of cooperation in industry, agriculture and other spheres of the economy and also on the possibility of the conclusion of compensatory deals in the engineering, mining, metallurgical, timber, chemical, pulp and paper and wood-processing sectors. The program reinforces the contractual-legal basis of commercial-economic cooperation between the USSR and Austria and imparts an even more stable nature to the development of mutually profitable relations.

An important contribution to the strengthening of business contacts is being made by the activity of the Mixed Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation. It helps us to learn each other's requirements better and determine the possibilities of their satisfaction.

The results that have been achieved in commercial-economic cooperation and the accumulated positive experience create real prerequisites for a further strengthening of mutually profitable relations. Austrian businessmen are interested in expanding the geography of foreign trade, particularly under the conditions of the structural reorganization of the country's economy. The Soviet Union is a diverse and capacious sales market, and the stability of its economic development creates favorable conditions for an increase in Austrian exports.

Cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist countries is helping Austria soften the crisis phenomena and maintain a comparatively high level of employment. "Thanks to Soviet orders and commercial deals with other socialist countries, jobs are provided for at least 150,000 workers," E. Scharf, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee for the Austrian Communist Party emphasized. "Without this factor, unemployment--the principal scourge of capitalist reality--would have doubled in the country."**

The level of economic cooperation between the two states and its stability and consistency have been valued highly by F. Sinowatz, chancellor of the Austrian Republic. He declared during his visit to Moscow in November 1984:

* VNESHNYAYA TORGOVLYA No 1, 1983, p 39; No 12, 1981, p 29.

** PRAVDA, 22 February 1984.

"I may mention with satisfaction the favorable development of our economic mutual relations. We have found in the Soviet Union a dependable and responsive trade partner, and I may say, I believe, that Austria also may count on the same evaluation in the USSR."

The good relations of many years' standing between Austria and the USSR serve as a graphic example of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. These relations are a factor of stability in Europe, serve the cause of peace and correspond to the interests of the peoples of both countries.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER IN WORLD TRADE DISCUSSED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 115-123

[Article by A. Bykov: "International Technology Exchange and World-Economy Relations"]

[Text] The second half of the present century has been marked by the impetuous growth of the scientific-technical revolution. This new historical phenomenon has exerted and continues to exert a powerful influence on the course of socioeconomic transformations, the development of the production forces and production relations, the military-political situation in the world, the nature of the historical competition of the two world social systems and the participation of different countries and regions in the worldwide division of labor.

The scientific-technical revolution entails a growth of the role of international technology exchange. This exchange,* which represents a particular sphere of the world division of labor, is expanding the most dynamically in contemporary world-economy relations. It is having an increasingly great impact on other directions in the division of labor and stimulating the development of joint-labor relations in the industrial engineering sphere and the concentration and specialization of production. Technology exchange, as also the entire process of the internationalization of production, science and technology, is acquiring additional impetus at the new stage of the scientific-technical revolution.

Within the framework of the world capitalist economy scientific-technical development and the exchanges connected therewith are accompanied by an exacerbation of interimperialist contradictions and a growth of the transnational activity of the monopolies, which are subordinating the economic and political life of many states to the interests of the main centers of present-day imperialism, primarily American. The monopolies' exploitation of the developing countries is increasing also, and a new form of neocolonialism--"technological"--is appearing.

* According to the terminology adopted in the United Nations, technology represents a knowledge of the methods of the processing of raw material, the production of goods and the granting of services, while international technology transfer is the acquisition thereof by one country from another or from an international organization. Technology may be transferred in pure and materialized form and in combination with other commercial-economic transactions, joint-labor primarily.

These processes are developing entirely differently under socialist conditions. The world socialist economy is a convincing example of equal and mutually profitable cooperation in the solution of complex problems of the acceleration of scientific-technical progress in the fraternal countries. Actively participating in the worldwide division of labor, in the exchange of technology with other countries and regions included, the socialist states are rendering the developing countries increasing assistance in the creation of the scientific-technical infrastructure and the strengthening of their production potential. This is enabling the developing countries to tackle tasks of socioeconomic development and resist the pressure of international imperialism.

The forces of imperialism have attempted repeatedly to use technology exchange as a means of blackmail and discrimination against the socialist countries and a lever of pressure in order to impede the course of socialist building and achieve unilateral advantages. A graphic example are the measures to restrict or ban supplies of modern technology to the USSR and the other socialist countries which have been adopted in recent years on the initiative of the United States.

The words and deeds of the extremely conservative grouping of the American bourgeoisie, which is in office and which is closely linked with the military-industrial complex and expresses its interests, testify that it intends using the new stage of the scientific-technical revolution and the country's technological potential to tackle a number of interconnected tasks of a strategic nature. First, to change in its favor the correlation of forces in the world, having imposed on the USSR and the other socialist countries a new round of the arms race and having thereby obstructed their socioeconomic programs.

Second, to gain the ascendancy in the technological competition with the other two centers of present-day capitalism, to which the diversion of additional resources into "rearmament" and reduced exchanges with the socialist countries are designed to contribute. Third, to keep the developing countries within the orbit of imperialism, as a dependent periphery, using for this methods of technological neocolonialism. The expansionist essence and goals of such a strategy and the adventurist nature of the latter, as, equally, the considerable role assigned it in the manipulation of international technology transfer, where the positions of the United States remain quite strong as yet, are obvious.

I

Characterizing imperialism, V.I. Lenin pointed to the fact that the concentration of production and the development of the monopolies are accompanied by a concentration of technical achievements: "Competition becomes a monopoly. The socialization of production achieves gigantic progress. The process of technical inventions and improvements is also socialized, in particular."*

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 27, p 320.

Under the conditions of the scientific-technical revolution and state-monopoly capitalism the use of science and industrial experience based thereon and the entire complex of scientific-technical and managerial knowledge, on which the economic and military-strategic power of this state or the other or grouping of countries depends to an increasingly great extent, becomes an even more effective means of the concentration of production and the external expansion of imperialism and the monopolies' winning of foreign markets and spheres of influence. They are actively assisted in this by the bourgeois state. There is an increase in the role of international technology transfer as a means of increasing the transnational activity of the biggest monopolies and their organization of production and marketing on a global scale.

The main recipients of the advantages of scientific-technical development and the exchanges connected therewith are the American monopolies, which have found themselves as a result of a number of factors of an internal and external nature in a privileged position compared with their competitors in many respects. These include the degree of concentration of scientific-technical capacity and the mechanism of the use of its products both in their own country and overseas. Defending the interests of its monopolies and the military-industrial complex, it was precisely the United States which energetically adopted a policy of winning world domination by relying on the temporary advantages in the use of modern technology both for military-strategic purposes (nuclear diplomacy) and for the purpose of foreign economic expansion.

However, the general correlation of world forces has changed in favor of socialism, which has displayed convincingly its socioeconomic, political and ideological advantages in the postwar period. At the same time a paramount role has been performed by the strengthening of the defense capability of the USSR and the entire socialist community, the liquidation of the American monopoly on nuclear weapons, the formation in response to NATO's intrigues of the Warsaw Pact and, finally, the establishment in the recent period of approximate parity with the West in arms.

As far as nonmilitary technology is concerned, its transfer to other countries has been employed and continues to be employed extensively by the U.S. Government and the monopolies as a most important tool of foreign economic policy and influence on other countries and competitors in the interests of the establishment of the dominant positions in the world economy and world-economy relations and the attachment of other states and regions to American imperialism. In the postwar period the United States has spent on R&D far more federal and private resources than the West European countries and Japan together.*

The predatory nature of American imperialism has also been manifested in the fact that the personnel potential of R&D in the United States was formed to a considerable extent thanks to the relocation there initially from West Europe, particularly in the war and first postwar years, and then from the developing states also of a thousands-strong army of scientists, including

* The United States' share of the capitalist world's total spending on R&D even now constitutes approximately half.

those of world renown, engineers and technicians, who did much to establish the country as the scientific-technical leader of the capitalist world.

The result of such leadership is the United States' firm first place in world licensing trade. Although the country practices extensively also the buying up of the most valuable foreign inventions, the ratio of its licensing exports and imports has invariably for a long period constituted 10:1. Endeavoring to obtain the maximum benefits from the use of their scientific-technical achievements overseas, the American monopolies put the emphasis on the acceleration of exports of science-intensive products. They are combined with the export of capital and technology for the organization of production outside of the country, in direct proximity to the sales markets. It is on this that the transnational activity of the American monopolies, which in the postwar period have concentrated on West Europe, is based.

At the same time the use of the United States' technology and managerial experience contributed to a considerable extent to the postwar recovery of the West European monopolies and also the reorganization and strengthening of the industrial engineering potential of Japan, which had suffered heavily in the war. In this period it has acted as a classical country of the extensive use of foreign scientific-technical achievements skillfully adapted to local conditions and the new demands of the world market.

The technology gap which came about in the postwar period between the United States and its most important competitors in the capitalist world was used by the U.S. Government and the monopolies to cobble together aggressive imperialist blocs. At the same time, however, this gap, which represented a threat to the national interests primarily of the West European countries, stimulated their efforts, urged on the process of West European integration and exacerbated the contradictions among the three centers of present-day imperialism which had taken shape.

None of this could have failed to have been reflected in the technological positions of the United States in the capitalist world, which even recently had been very strong. The weakening of its positions was also connected with the reduction in proportional expenditure on R&D in the GNP (in constant prices) which was observed on the eve and at the outset of the 1970's. This phenomenon, which was recorded in a number of other capitalist countries also, was connected with the growing crisis phenomena characteristic of the entire world capitalist economy and the monopolies' reluctance under the conditions of an unfavorable market and inflation to expand investment activity and invest resources in costly innovations.

An important indication of the weakening of the United States' world economic positions was the decline in the growth rate of labor productivity, in which there was virtually no increase in the 1970's.* The gap in respect of this indicator with the most important competitors declined considerably in this

* Whereas in the period 1957-1973 the average annual labor productivity growth rate in manufacturing industry constituted 2.8 percent, in the period 1973-1978 it constituted 1.6 percent.

period, which caused considerable difficulties for American business, particularly on world markets.* The U.S. economy is losing its dynamic nature, nor, as generally acknowledged, is everything as it should be with its technological superiority.

New trends have been discerned as of the end of the 1970's in the scientific-technical policy of the leading capitalist powers, including the United States, which, with this fluctuation or the other, continue today also. Appropriations for R&D are growing again (up to 3 percent of GNP annually in the United States in constant prices). The bourgeois states are endeavoring to make more extensive use of the scientific-technical factor as a means of domestic and foreign policy. Budget appropriations for fundamental research, without which a stable level of scientific-technical progress is impossible, are being increased and production capital's depreciation period has been reduced in the United States.

Appropriations for military research, which reflects the increase in aggressive trends in the policy of the U.S. Administration, are growing considerably. A certain reorientation of the goals of the United States' scientific-technical policy with regard for the intensified energy, ecological and other structural crises is under way. The government is intensifying its influence on the shaping and realization of long-term programs in this sphere by way of the corresponding legislative and administrative measures. They include measures to stimulate foreign technological expansion and to tie it in better with the foreign policy course.

All this conceals a hope for the effective utilization of the new opportunities afforded by the scientific-technical revolution to strengthen the shaken economic and political positions of American capital. The science-intensive product constitutes, as is known, the most competitive item of U.S. industrial exports, which as a whole are not covering the cost of imports.**

Taking advantage of accumulated and newly created scientific process stock, American imperialism is counting by way of the accelerated replacement of the list of manufactured products, primarily fundamentally new science-intensive products, on increasing the export potential and strengthening the scientific-technical thrust of its world-economy specialization with regard for the structural shifts which have been discerned. There are thereby increased possibilities for exports of technology in pure and materialized form and, consequently, possibilities for scientific-technical hegemonism. The latter is being used to derive economic and political benefits, maintain other states' dependence on the United States, weaken the positions of competitors and strengthen the policy of technological imperialism and neocolonialism.

* Thus in the period 1973-1980 the average annual labor productivity increase per worker in the United States was the equivalent of 0.2 and in the other OECD countries 2.2, that is, 10 times more.

** Roughly one-fourth of the United States' domestic requirements are satisfied by imports, while its share of world capitalist exports declined from 18.1 percent in 1950 to 11.1 percent in 1981 and is continuing to decline.

However, such a policy is inevitably clashing with the interests of other leading capitalist states, which are reorienting their structural policy in the same direction. They are endeavoring to concentrate science-intensive production in their own countries and transfer to other countries, developing primarily, the most labor- and materials-consuming, predominantly traditional processes, including those connected with the processing of raw material and those which are ecologically harmful.

Japan is proving highly successful in the structural reorientation. It has already surpassed the United States in the manufacture of steel, ships, automobiles and a number of types of electronic and other modern equipment and has a real chance in the future of occupying the leading positions in the sphere of robotics and the automation and computerization of production. Both Japan and West Europe (primarily the EEC countries) have become major economic and scientific-technical centers of the capitalist world competing successfully with the United States. In the past they, particularly Japan, made skillful use of American equipment and technology, developed their own scientific-technical potential, appreciably replaced the production machinery, successfully assimilated the manufacture of new science-intensive products and lowered the production costs and increased the competitiveness of the products. On this basis they have been able to seriously squeeze out the United States on both the commodity and capital markets. Japan has moved into second place (behind the United States) in the capitalist world in the amount of expenditure on R&D and technology exports.

All this permits the belief that the new stage in the unfolding of the scientific-technical revolution and the structural reorganization connected therewith will exacerbate even further the contradictions and rivalry among the main centers of present-day imperialism. They will also raise the role of the scientific-technical factor in the interimperialist confrontation and, consequently, the significance of the technology transfusion in the world-economy relations of capitalism.

II

Technology exchange in the foreign economic relations of the socialist countries has also played an important part. The USSR, as is known, moved quite extensively onto the world technology market back in the prewar period, purchasing the machinery, equipment and technical experience necessary for industrialization and selling licenses for its inventions. At the same time the basis of its retooling was and remains its own scientific-technical and industrial potential. It is this which enabled it to strengthen the country's defense capability in the face of the looming military threat, ensure the material prerequisites for the historic victory in the Great Patriotic War, resist the nuclear blackmail in the cold war period and then achieve military-strategic equilibrium with the West.

With the formation of the world socialist system technology exchange has been concentrated mainly within its framework. And the main supplier of scientific-technical knowledge and its material vectors has been and remains, furthermore, the USSR as the economically and technically most powerful

country of the socialist community.* According to available calculations, in the period 1948-1970 alone Soviet technological experience, which was transferred virtually gratis, enabled the fraternal states to save \$20 billion, which they would have had to have spent to acquire similar technology on the world capitalist market. Inasmuch as the most important sectors of industry were responsible for the main supplies of Soviet technology their role in the industrialization of these countries is obvious.

When evaluating the significance of technology exchange between socialist countries it should also be considered that the cold war period accounted for a considerable volume thereof. At this time the United States and its allies pursued a policy of strict embargoes on supplies and credits to the socialist countries, which primarily limited the making of modern technology available to them. Thus mutual assistance and reliance on the Soviet scientific-technical and industrial potential serves as a most important prerequisite of the successful development of the economy and the implementation of transformations in the socialist countries and enabled them to avoid the need to go west to the "technology Canossa" and get into the economic and political costs connected therewith.

There was an extraordinary expansion of the socialist countries' scientific-technical cooperation with the formation of CEMA in 1949. In the sphere of technology exchange CEMA adopted the well-known "Sofia principles" in the first year of its existence. They made the general norm the most preferential conditions, unburdened by formalities, already being practiced on a bilateral basis. Subsequently new, more profound forms of scientific-technical cooperation appeared and became firmly established connected with coordination, joint labor and joint research of mutual interest to its participants. This made it possible to switch from predominantly exchange transactions to cooperation in the development and application of new equipment and technology; to the most efficient comprehensive forms thereof encompassing by uniform plan-based and contractual regulation the entire process--from scientific developments through the use of their results.

The adoption of the Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration in 1971 imparted new dimensions to cooperation in science and technology, which constitutes a most important sphere in the integration process. It has made it possible to shape organizationally and economically the new trends which had taken shape earlier, in reciprocal technology exchange included. This exchange is effected with regard for the policy of intensification of cooperation on a gratis and payment basis depending on the subject of the exchange (its novelty, patentability and possibility of commercial use) and the level of economic development of the recipient country, and the significance of the forms subject to payment is growing, furthermore.

* In the period 1948-1978 the USSR transferred to the CEMA countries and Yugoslavia approximately 35,000 complete sets of production forms and records and obtained from them approximately 17,000 complete sets. Currently an increasingly large part of such exchange is effected within the framework of joint labor, while efficiency promotion thanks to the introduction of forms which are subject to payment could not have failed to have been reflected in the volume of exchange transactions.

Machinery and equipment--the material vectors of scientific-technical progress--constitute the most promising item of the CEMA countries' reciprocal commodity turnover. Their share of reciprocal trade constitutes more than 40 percent, and specialized products account for 41 percent of the volume of these supplies, furthermore. The "technological load" of the supplies is growing considerably thanks to new, more accomplished and high-quality types, although the optimum in this process has not yet been reached. For this reason the extension of international specialization and cooperation in science, technology and production sets the task of an appreciable rise in the technical-economic indicators and competitiveness of the machinery and equipment supplied by the CEMA countries and the general science-intensiveness of their production and exports and a rise in the community's self-sufficiency in new equipment and technology.

The ongoing structural reorganization of the world economy, the emergence of the scientific-technical revolution at new frontiers and the policy of intensification are bringing about a need for an appreciable acceleration of the process of orientation of socialist integration toward the latest achievements of science and technology. This process demands the corresponding long-term collective strategy and the intensification of joint-labor relations within the "science--production" complex, including exchange transactions and the creation for this of the necessary planning-economic, organizational and production engineering prerequisites, particularly at the microlevel.

As is known, paramount significance in economic cooperation is attached to intensive production and scientific-technical cooperation. This also fully corresponds to world trends, the CEMA states' policy of production intensification the need to reorient the integration process toward a more progressive model corresponding to the realities of the world socialist division of labor and the new world-economy situation and to the accumulated experience of the joint solution of large-scale national economic problems.

The priority areas of engineering have been outlined, these including: means of automation and modern computer equipment; the creation of a standardized element base; the creation of mechanical arm-robots and other means of mechanizing laborious processes; the development of machinery and equipment providing for the economical use of fuel and energy; and a number of others. Large-scale multilateral agreements are being realized in the sphere of nuclear engineering, computers and microelectronics and robotics. More attention is being paid to the introduction of new materials and techniques, including bioengineering. All this is intended to strengthen the positions of the socialist community in the system of world-economy relations and reduce technological dependence on unreliable extraregional sources.

The concerted economic and, particularly, scientific-technical policy, the development of direct relations between national departments, enterprises and scientific research organizations, the use of program-goal forms and methods of cooperation, its concentration in the priority areas, the continued improvement of the mechanism of economic planning at the national and integration levels and their synchronization will contribute to realization of the policy charted by the CEMA countries. A great deal of work is being done in the course of meetings of the CEMA states at interparty and intergovernment levels, which was demonstrated convincingly by the results of the recent top-level economic conference.

As a most important stage in the formulation and realization of concerted strategy for the long term, the conference deemed it necessary to take a new step forward for the more extensive coordination of economic policy in the spheres connected with mutual cooperation and, by the countries concerned, in other spheres of socioeconomic development. It is a question of the formulation on a collective basis of ways of solving major economic problems and of direct interaction in the sphere of science, technology, production and capital construction. Particular attention will be paid to the all-around intensification of production, the introduction of world achievements of scientific-technical progress and the provision of these countries with resources and modern machinery and equipment. This will enable them to participate more actively in the international socialist and world division of labor and accelerate the equalization of their economic levels. The ways of formulating such a collective strategy have been determined also: from regular top-level meetings through an improvement in the coordination of national economic plans--the main instrument of the coordination of economic policy and its concentration on the accomplishment of the priority tasks.

Considering particularly urgent the utmost acceleration of scientific-technical progress, the conferees agreed on the development of a Comprehensive Program of the CEMA Countries' Scientific-Technical Progress for 15-20 Years as the base for the formulation of a concerted and, in certain spheres, uniform scientific-technical policy. Its purpose is the speediest solution by joint efforts of the most important questions in the sphere of science and technology and the introduction in production on mutually profitable terms of the results that have been achieved. The program is intended to determine the corresponding priorities and ways of concentrating collective efforts at them and elaborate the mechanism of an improvement in mutual cooperation both at the macro- and microlevels. We refer primarily to comprehensive cooperation encompassing by uniform regulation (planning-organizational and economic) all the reproduction elements, the intra- and extraregional factors of its efficient realization and their optimum mutual complementariness.

Realization of a collective strategy makes objectively necessary an increase in the interaction and coordination of the CEMA countries in the use of the scientific process stock and all the scientific-technical and other factors which exist in the community. It is essential to determine precisely the areas where it is possible to swiftly and efficiently reach foremost frontiers in research, production and on the market and those where it is preferable to borrow extraregional technology in this form or the other supplementing one's own possibilities. In the second case a mechanism of efficient cooperation to ensure that the acquired technology become the property and an organic component of the entire integration process precluding the practice, which has yet to disappear, of extravagant parallelism and lack of coordination, which is reflected in the pace of this process, is essential.

Concerted efforts are also essential for an intensification of the CEMA countries' emergence on the world market with their own technology--national and that acquired in the course of cooperation. Measures which have already been and are now being implemented, including the standardization of the demands made of cover documents and their mutual recognition and the creation of an international system of patent information, are performing a certain positive role. However, no less has still to be done, at which the decisions of the economic conference are aimed.

The extension of the integration process and the fuller use of the CEMA countries' scientific-technical and production potential by no means signify their turn toward autarky (national or collective), as some people in the West are attempting to interpret this natural process. The CEMA states, the economic conference observed, have always been consistent opponents of economic exclusiveness and have persistently advocated and continue to advocate extensive mutually profitable cooperation with other states, the normalization of international economic relations and the removal of any barriers in the way of their development. It was for this reason that the conferees emphatically opposed the trade, credit and technological blockade which the West, under pressure from Washington, is attempting to make an integral part of its policy in respect of the socialist countries.

III

In the development of East-West economic cooperation, in which both sides have an objective interest, technology exchange also plays an important part, which is perfectly natural, considering the place which its participants occupy in the development of world scientific-technical progress. Together with the traditional buying and selling of licenses for patented inventions and know-how and machinery and equipment embodying technical knowledge other forms of technology exchange are employed also. These include the granting of "engineering"-type services, technical assistance, equipment leasing, industrial joint labor, including technology exchange, and the installation and joint use on this legal basis or the other of industrial and other facilities. Scientific-technical and science-production cooperation, including that based on the scientific process stock of one or both sides, is becoming widespread.

The rate of the development of East-West cooperation as a whole and technology exchange between them has slowed somewhat as of the latter half of the 1970's. This has been connected with a certain asymmetry of the commodity flows and the difficulties which it has caused in supply and credit payments which have been maintained and intensified in recent years by artificial restrictions on the part of the capitalist countries on supplies and credit to the socialist states, discrimination (tariff and nontariff restrictions) against their commodities on Western markets, a deterioration in business conditions and the inflationary surge of prices. However, the general trend of the continued development and diversification of such cooperation has been maintained. The increased crisis phenomena in the capitalist states are prompting them to seek new paths of cooperation with the socialist countries for an expansion of capacity and a curbing of the growth of unemployment.

The balance of East-West technology exchange is taking shape unequally and, as a whole, can hardly be precisely determined. Whereas in terms of machinery and equipment the West has a considerable surplus balance, there is a far from synonymous situation in respect of license exchange for different countries and fields. In addition, whereas the socialist countries sell the West predominantly "pure" licenses, they purchase a considerable number of licenses accompanying supplies of equipment, which is also reflected in the reciprocal flow volumes. Furthermore, commercial exchange does not take account of the transfusion of theoretical knowledge (effected predominantly in a

noncurrency form), which is acquiring particular significance under the conditions of the scientific-technical revolution. The positions of the USSR and the other CEMA countries are very strong here.

It is not surprising that competent specialists in the West who are far from political speculation are entirely justifiably confirming the mutually profitable nature of technology exchange with the socialist countries--both from the viewpoint of its promotion of world scientific-technical progress and on a purely commercial plane. This ensues from the scale of the CEMA countries' scientific-technical potential, which constitutes one-third of world potential, and also their successes in the development of science and the concentration here of up to one-half of the newly created world collection of inventions and one-third of world industrial production. Unfortunately, only a comparatively small part of this huge potential has been enlisted in the system of the worldwide division of labor. This is explained by many factors, including the discriminatory policy of the capitalist powers.

A policy leading to an intensification of protectionism has been discerned and a fear of giving rise to new competitors in the shape of the socialist countries has appeared in the West. In the political sphere the capitalist states are endeavoring to disunite the socialist countries by way of the use of the so-called differentiated approach. It is with this that the different trade-economic terms granted this socialist country or the other on the part of the United States and some of its allies and exclusive economic groupings of the West is connected. This also explains to a considerable extent the EEC's unwillingness to recognize CEMA as a partner in the regulation of the relations between the two integration associations and its aspiration to bilateral regulation of trade-economic relations with each CEMA member individually.

Relapses into the cold war in the sphere of technology exchange have been observed repeatedly in recent years, but the U.S. Administration is now actively endeavoring to revive the past practice in full, primarily in the given sphere of international cooperation. This was expressed in the embargo on supplies to the USSR of new equipment and technology, which froze several hundred export licenses. Its effective sphere was then extended to conventional industrial exports also if they, in the arbitrary opinion of American (primarily Pentagon) officials, could if only indirectly "contribute to an increase in the Soviet military potential."

Currently Washington officials have adopted the fraudulent version to the effect that the USSR is obliged for virtually all its successes, particularly in the military sphere, to Western, primarily American, technology. For this reason, it is said, the American taxpayer is now having to shell out to restore the lost equilibrium and, essentially, secure the United States' military superiority, particularly in new weapons systems. The hope is that the USSR will not withstand the competition in the arms race economically and technically and that its scientific-technical potential and the mechanism of its use will not permit it to keep pace with the West.

For the purpose of internationalizing the embargo policy the U.S. Administration has made efforts to stimulate the activity of COCOM--the Coordinating Committee for Control of Exports to the Socialist Countries--which was created within the NATO structure at the time of the cold war and in which the participants in this bloc (except Spain and Iceland) and Japan are represented. On the initiative of the United States the list of equipment and technology which it is not allowed to supply to the socialist countries is again being extended and proposals for the establishment of ceilings on the exchange of industrial products with them and the determination of their selection are being examined in COCOM. Washington is raising the question of a strengthening of the ban on the supply of primarily "pure" technology, particularly so-called "critical technologies," and also dual-use (military and civil) technology.

At the same time the strongest pressure has been put on the allies of the United States and certain nonaligned countries to force them to follow the lead of the adventurist policy of the present U.S. Administration. The results of recent "big seven" meetings have shown convincingly the United States' stubborn endeavor to cobble together by any means a united antisocialist front, primarily in technology, moreover. For realization of this policy it is employing any, even purely police, measures, and on a global scale, what is more.

Life has proven repeatedly the soundness of V.I. Lenin's conclusion that economic blockade is a two-edged weapon. "As regards blockade, experience has shown," V.I. Lenin wrote, "that it is not known for whom it is more difficult: for those who are being blockaded or those who are doing the blockading."* The first results of such U.S. policy testify that it is the American side which is the loser. The U.S. Administration has punished first of all the working people and the business circles of its own country unconnected with military business and interested in the development of mutually beneficial economic and scientific-technical relations with the USSR and the other socialist countries for an increase in employment and profits.

The measures aimed at undermining cooperation and torpedoing detente have found themselves under the fire of criticism not only abroad but also in the United States itself. A particularly sharp reaction was evoked by the U.S. ban on the supply of equipment for the USSR--West Europe gas pipeline by foreign firms using American licenses and also foreign affiliates of American corporations, which forced Reagan to recant.

With certain exceptions the United States' allies did not express a readiness to subordinate themselves to the whims of the U.S. Administration, despite formal statements about "Atlantic solidarity". While some of them, primarily in West Europe, to judge by the numerous statements, were by no means disposed to limit East-West cooperation, in the sphere of civil technology included, which was expressed in new agreements and deals.

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 44, p 301.

The new agreements attest a realism and unwillingness to jeopardize everything that it has been possible to achieve in recent years under the conditions of detente and the expansion of mutually profitable East-West cooperation. Its fruits--of a political and economic order--have been perceived to a considerably greater extent in West Europe than in the United States. After all, it is precisely Europe that is responsible for the bulk of the exchange and East-West cooperation and it is here that detente has sunk the deepest roots, bringing considerable advantages to both sides.

It is not surprising that the FRG (the USSR's biggest trading partner in the West), while paying tribute to "Atlantic solidarity," not only has not reduced but has increased the scale of trade-economic and scientific-technical cooperation with the Soviet Union. Nor has the United States been successful in achieving appreciable concessions in questions of limiting exchange with the USSR and other socialist countries on the part of the nonaligned states either. In response to the American pressure a number of them has stepped up such exchange even.

In a word, the idea of the creation of an "economic NATO" has not been duly supported and has only engendered new seeds of discord in the "Atlantic family" and increased the criticism of American policy throughout the world. However, this has by no means weakened Washington's aspiration to tighten technological discrimination against the socialist countries and impart a global nature to its restrictions and bans.

The latter, like Washington's entire inordinate assertiveness aimed at a strict regulation for its narrow egotistical purposes of East-West technology exchange, is seriously worrying official and, particularly, business circles of the West European countries and Japan and giving rise to criticism in the United States itself. Nonetheless, all this is as yet being alternated with compromises, and it is these, moreover, which sometimes gain the ascendancy. The results of the recent COCOM sessions, where the United States' partners, after lengthy debate, consented in principle to a tightening of the restrictions on supplies to the socialist countries of certain types of new technology, testify to this. This has already been reflected in the fulfillment of a number of their orders and could in the future, if this practice continues, detach from mutually profitable cooperation the rapidly developing science-intensive sectors, where cooperation and exchanges are most promising for both sides with regard for their economic development trends.

The deterioration in the international situation and the increased aggressiveness of American imperialism and the restrictions on business contacts and exchange connected with this, which are undermining trust in the Western countries, primarily the United States, serve as a reminder that it is essential to step up the struggle for detente and its materialization in every possible way in the interests of peace and progress. It is no less important to combine this struggle with the CEMA countries' energetic joint measures for the further consolidation of their forces, collective resistance to the discriminatory measures that have been intensified against them, the extension and improvement of the integration process, primarily in the scientific-technical sphere and the consolidation of their collective technological and technical-economic

self-sufficiency and invulnerability. In this respect great significance is attached to realization of the set of measures elaborated at the recent CEMA sessions and, particularly, at the top-level CEMA economic conference.

IV

The scientific-technical revolution and the exchanges connected therewith are having an increasingly big impact on the fate of the developing countries, which by the efforts of world imperialism are being artificially kept outside of the sphere of its influence. The ratio of expenditure on R&D in the developed capitalist and developing states far exceeds the gap between them in terms of other most important economic indicators. At the same time it is obvious that for the genuine independence and solution of the acute socioeconomic problems of the emergent states their extensive use of the achievements of science and technology and the creation of their own scientific-technical potential (on a national and international basis) oriented toward the specific conditions in this region combined with a growing influx of technology from other regions on favorable terms are essential.

The initial period of the unfolding of the scientific-technical revolution, which coincided in time with the collapse of the colonial empires, signified for Western countries the formation of predominantly reciprocal economic and technological relations. The developing world was assigned the very modest place of supplier of cheap, primarily energy, resources. Under the conditions of the tightening energy crisis, however, and the growth of the economic power of a number of developing countries the West is endeavoring to revise the global development model.

Its transnational corporations are transferring to these countries the traditional resource-consuming and ecologically "dirty" processes, concentrating their own efforts in the new science-intensive and resource-saving areas. Together with this the developing countries' general specialization in the production of raw material for the developed capitalist countries supplemented by certain industrial enclaves dependent on the latter is preserved. It is in this plane that the proposition concerning interdependence along North--South lines, which has been spread persistently in recent years, should be understood. Such interdependence is being recalled increasingly often at the periodic meetings of the leaders of the leading capitalist countries.

The interdependence motif is heard even more definitely in the highly sensationalized works on the future of world-economy relations written by prominent representatives of Western political and social thought.* They attempt to reconcile the contradictions of capitalism with the solution of the urgent problems of the developing states thanks to a new twist of the technological revolution spiral within the framework of the subsequent division of labor. The developing world guarantees the West supplies of raw material and energy in exchange for the technology which it needs, thereby

* The reference is primarily to a report of the Independent Commission for International Development, which is headed by W. Brandt, published at the start of 1983.

creating the prerequisites for normal reproduction at the initial and final stages. In such a bipolar world the developing countries are assigned the role of economic appendage of the capitalist economy and sphere of profitable capital investment. Such an outline completely ignores the socialist countries' growing possibilities in terms of rendering the developing world technical assistance and in mutually profitable joint labor with it.

However, life is far more complicated than far-fetched outlines. The developing countries do not intend folding their arms in anticipation of the time when the West will serve them up the next rescue solution. For a number of years now these states' foreign economic activity has been developing under the sign of struggle for the establishment of a new international economic order. It is intended to put an end to the unjust division of labor imposed by capitalism, replacing it with a new system of relations. These relations should be based on recognition of the developing countries' legitimate right to be masters of their own resources and their own future, participate in world-economy life on an equal basis and have access to modern knowledge and its material vectors with regard for the specific interests and requirements of development.

Despite all the inconsistency of these requirements, it is essentially a question of a reorganization of the entire system of world-economy relations with regard for the new alignment of world forces and new problems. Among these a particular place is occupied by the problem of liquidation of the economic, technical and cultural backwardness of a vast region. Direct responsibility for it lies with those who in the period of colonialism condemned to poverty and extinction the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries and subsequently by means of neocolonialism have impeded in every possible way a change in their situation.

The problem of introducing all countries, particularly the developing countries, to the scientific-technical revolution is extraordinarily important. The imperialist forces, however, which are artificially screening the developing world off from it now see "technological neocolonialism" as the most effective means of preserving untouched the dependence of the developing states. In addition, for the technology which they do acquire the latter have to pay colossal amounts, which run into billions of dollars annually.*

In the course of the elaboration of a new international economic order the entire system of the imperialist exploitation of the emergent states by monopoly capital, including new forms of "technological imperialism," has been subjected to sharp, justified criticism. These forms are designed to reproduce and intensify by more accomplished means the economic dependence of the developing countries by way of the creation in them of industrial enclaves entirely oriented abroad. Technology is being transfused into these countries along the channels of the transnational monopolies, which control up to four-fifths of world technology exchange. They leave virtually untouched the

* Fidel Castro, "The World's Economic and Social Crisis," Havana, 1983, p 145.

national sector of the economy and do not consider the genuine interests of national development.

An important place in the system of measures of a new international economic order which are being discussed is occupied by the development of an international code of conduct at the time of technology transfer which is intended to create favorable conditions for technology exchange on the principles of equality and mutual benefit, with regard for the specific interests and requirements of the developing countries.

Measures to neutralize the "restrictive" practice of the monopolies, in the sphere of the transfer and use of technology included, are directly linked with this. They are designed to put their transnational activity within a certain framework and make it less painful for the economy and interests of the countries to which it is being disseminated. This means, further, a corresponding revision of the Paris and other conventions governing industrial ownership in order to better take account of the interests of different countries, primarily the developing countries.

Finally, it is the complex "brain drain" problem, which is doing colossal damage to the developing countries and enriching the monopolies.* A change in the existing unequal conditions and any limitation of the predatory practice of the monopolies, particularly in the sphere of technology and its use, is being opposed in every possible way by the capitalist states. Confirmation of this was the fifth session of the UN Conference on an International Code of Conduct at the Time of Technology Transfer (Geneva, 1983), which was practically without result.

The Western countries, which have been forced in words to support the development of a new international economic order, are hypocritically putting forward in this connection the idea of "partnership" and "interdependence" and, consequently, an allegedly acceptable compromise for them. In practice, however, they have done and continue to do everything to ensure that such an order represent merely a somewhat modified version of that which exists, including technology transfer. And today, when the tune is being called in the United States and a number of other Western countries by neoconservatives, they consider it most expedient to change nothing at all since the traditional market combined with purely power methods is capable, they believe, of solving everything and putting everyone in his place both in the developing world and in the world as a whole.

* According to UNCTAD data, over 300,000 specialists of the developing countries, including 100,000 engineers and scientific associates, 61,000 doctors and 123,000 technical and other specialists, emigrated to the United States, Canada and Britain alone in the period 1961-1976. The developing countries lose considerably more than they gain from the developed capitalist countries here in the form of "aid" along capitalist lines. Although under the conditions of the economic recession in the West the influx of "brains" from the developing countries has diminished somewhat, imperialism's predatory approach in respect of these countries' intellectual potential has not changed.

As far as the socialist countries are concerned, their political and economic support for the national liberation movement and aspiration of the developing states to consolidate independence and improve their positions in the system of the division of labor with the West is generally recognized and proceeds from the profound internationalist essence of the new social system. The socialist community is actively assisting the progress of the emergent countries, the consolidation of the state sector of their economy and the elimination of the legacy of colonialism, including "technological" dependence. The economic and technical assistance of the CEMA countries to almost 100 developing states rendered on a bilateral and, in individual cases, on a multilateral basis with the use of the CEMA mechanism serves as an important factor of the strengthening of their national economy, primarily by way of the creation of an industrial base and scientific-technical infrastructure and an increase in export potential.

The CEMA countries' growing commodity turnover with the developing states includes a broad flow of machinery and equipment and complete-set supplies on the part of the former and a growing quantity of return finished products and industrial semimanufactures on the part of the latter, including those produced by them at enterprises built with the assistance of the CEMA countries. Over 5,000 industrial and other facilities are being built and are planned for construction in the young states with the economic and technical assistance of the CEMA countries. In this way and also via the numerous national specialist personnel of various levels and qualifications trained by the CEMA countries and the educational, planning-design and other centers which they have created the developing states are receiving a powerful transfusion of technology which is creating the prerequisites for their economic and technical development independent of imperialism.

The volume of licenses and production forms and records granted the developing countries is increasing also. Whereas initially they were a component of comprehensive technical assistance in the design and installation of industrial facilities, licenses are now frequently sold in "pure" form. Licenses are exported to the developing states (10-20 percent of this form of the CEMA countries' exports) on as simplified terms as possible in respect of payments and the degree of use of the transferred knowledge.

As a whole technology transfer in various forms represents a highly promising sphere of the CEMA countries' cooperation with the developing states which helps them counteract imperialism's use of the technology weapon for economic and political pressure on both these groups of countries. In a complex with other forms, primarily joint-labor, technology transfer is creating the conditions for long-standing deepening mutual relations of an industrial engineering nature corresponding to the interests of both sides.

Consistently realizing in practice the principles of interstate relations of the new type in their mutual cooperation and also in relations with other countries, the socialist states, as the declaration adopted by the CEMA economic conference in Moscow emphasized, are making an effective contribution to the reorganization of international economic relations on a just democratic basis.

The continued development of the scientific-technical revolution, which the United States and its allies are attempting to use for an unchecked buildup of the arms race and the recarving in their own interests of the system of the worldwide division of labor, is putting in acute focus a number of most important global problems. They are primarily the extensive use in the interests of peace and creation of the powerful forces of science and technology and the normalization of world-economy relations.

It is the USSR and the socialist community which are setting an example of the just, democratic accomplishment of the task of combination of the possibilities of modern science and technology with broad equal mutually profitable international cooperation in the creative use of their achievements. These ideas permeate the Warsaw Pact Political Declaration (5 January 1983) and its Joint Statement (28 June 1983) and the decisions of the CEMA top-level economic conference.

"The CEMA countries," the declaration "Preservation of Peace and International Economic Cooperation" observes, "are consistent supporters of the adoption of effective decisions and actions aimed at the exclusion of any exploitation in international economic relations and at unimpeded international scientific-technical cooperation...." The CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum spoke of the Soviet Union's readiness to develop fruitful and all-around economic cooperation constructed on the principles of mutual benefit and precluding any discrimination and new forms of economic relations based on the joint development of scientific-technical and technological innovations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

PRIMAKOV BOOK ON CAMP DAVID ACCORDS REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 133-135

[V. Avakov review: "Behind the Camp David Facade"]

[Text] The book in question by Academician Ye.M. Primakov* is a kind of continuation of his preceding monograph "Anatomiya blizhnevostochnogo konflikta" [Anatomy of the Near East Conflict], which was published in 1978. Devoted to the prehistory, content and results of the Camp David deal between the United States, Israel and Egypt, this work could rightly be subtitled "Anatomy of an Anti-Arab Conspiracy".

The author gave the book a different subtitle--"The United States' Near East Policy in the 1970's-Start of the 1980's"--thereby accentuating attention on what seems to him to be of paramount significance: "The book, which is about the inner springs of the Camp David conspiracy, the circumstances and conditions which contributed to it and its consequences, is at the same time a book about U.S. policy in the Near East in the 1970's-start of the 1980's" (p 3).

The concept of the "Camp David process" has become firmly established in international-policy literature. It imbibes, as it were, the provisional framework of the preparation and realization of the Camp David agreements, the multilateral nature of the measures which preceded their signing and which were implemented subsequently, the particular role of the United States and Israel on the one hand and the capitulationist policy of Sadat's Egypt on the other and the anti-Arab and, in particular, anti-Palestinian thrust of the conspiracy between Washington, Tel Aviv and Cairo.

The gallery of political and psychological portraits of the "peacemakers" themselves--A. Sadat, M. Begin, M. Dayan, A. Sharon, J. Carter, H. Kissinger, Z. Brzezinski and others--created by the author will be of undoubted interest to the reader. There is the portrait of the young Sadat, who was consumed

* "Istoriya odnogo sgovora (Blizhnevostochnaya politika SShA v 70-e-nachale 80-x godov)" [History of a Conspiracy (the United States' Near East Policy in the 1970's-Start of the 1980's)], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1985, p 320.

by a special allegiance to Hitler Germany and cooperated with German intelligence, for which he was ultimately jailed. "My admiration of German militarism," Sadat wrote, "is beyond description. Were I to attempt to describe it, I would not find sufficient words in the Arab language to express my tremendous admiration and the depth of my love. I was amazed by Hitler and, before him, by the German martial spirit. When Rommel conducted the offensive in the Western Desert, purging it of the British, he simultaneously began to win my heart. He captured my heart and my dreams and inspired me..." (p 20). The adduced facts from Sadat's resume characterize him as an unscrupulous, cowardly and adventurist person who acted impulsively and was disposed toward graft and easy gain. "At the same time," the author observes, "the psychological portrait of Sadat would be far from complete if mention were not made of his decisiveness and tactical skill which he displayed at times....He undoubtedly represented a clever figure, a guileful, 'worldly' cunning..." (p 21).

Israel skillfully exploited individual features of A. Sadat's character, mainly his suspicious nature and vanity (pp 159-161). The United States also adroitly took advantage of the frailties of the former Egyptian president. Of course, it was not the latter's individual singularities which predetermined the part which Egypt was to play in the "Camp David process". But the significance of the subjective factor was obviously considerable.

For fairness' sake it should be noted that the roots of the degeneration of the Egyptian regime had been concealed in the negative features which had appeared in Egypt's political life even at the time of President J. Nasir. Trends which subsequently came to be developed within the country within the framework of the "infitakh" policy and, in the foreign policy sphere, in a radical change of course had begun to gather strength in Egypt following the 1967 defeat. And the social base on which A. Sadat came to rely had begun to take shape prior to his assumption of office. The domestic and foreign policy shifts which occurred in Egypt in the 1970's created the objective basis for the Sadat regime's participation in the anti-Arab conspiracy.

No less characteristic is the portrait of former Israeli Prime Minister Begin. Thoroughly analyzing his ideological platform and the expansionist goals of the Likud bloc which he headed, Ye. Primakov shows that for the success of the Camp David deal the coincidence in time of the regime of Sadat in Egypt and the regime of Begin in Israel was "optimum". The shift of accents which had been discerned as of the mid-1970's in U.S. military-strategic concepts and the reassessment of foreign policy aims which had begun in Washington also naturally affected the American attitude toward the prospects of a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The nature of the modification of the strategic interests and the increased military thrust of the policy of the United States in the Near East and its general departure from the policy of a relaxation of international tension were manifestly conducive to a separate Egyptian-Israeli treaty. "This," the author observes, "added to the situation a very important element for the success of the Camp David deal: the United States' readiness to assume the role of its direct organizer and patron" (p 148).

The history of the preparation and signing of the Camp David agreements and, later, of the Egyptian-Israeli Treaty is a history of shameless bargaining, overt and covert blackmail, pressure, mutual recrimination and innuendo and deception and threats in which Sadat appeared as the party condemned to give way and consent in the face of the pressure of the United States and the "stubbornness" of Israel. The book adduces many new and interesting facts enabling us to acquaint ourselves better and more fully with the backstage aspect of the deal. At the same time it makes a serious and in-depth analysis of the documents signed at Camp David and in Washington themselves and also the numerous "accompanying notes" exchanged by the participants in the deal.

Sadat triumphed, having achieved consent to the liberation of occupied Sinai. But he achieved this at the price of betrayal of the national interest of Egypt itself and the cherished aspirations of the Arab people of Palestine and the other Arab peoples. It is appropriate to draw attention in this connection to an extract quoted in the monograph from J. Nasir's speech at Cairo University on 25 April 1968: "...were it only necessary to liberate Sinai, all this would be easy. But, after all, it is a question of our destiny, of the destiny of the Arabs. To liberate Sinai it is necessary to accept the American-Israeli terms and leave Jerusalem, the West Bank of the Jordan and other Arab land at the mercy of Israel....The problem is not Sinai, it is far broader and deeper. It is a question for us of: to be or not to be. The problem of liquidating the consequences of the aggression is far bigger than the liberation of Sinai: will we remain an independent, sovereign state or will we fall under a sphere of influence?!" (p 11).

The consequences of the Camp David deal were not slow to take effect. The further development of events has fully corroborated the soundness of these words. The author shows how Israel, having tied Egypt's hands by the Camp David agreements, began step by step, methodically to strengthen control on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip. Even some "shouts" from Washington, quite weak and formal, failed to stop Israel enacting on 30 July 1980--in manifest violation of international law--a so-called "basic law" which proclaims all of Jerusalem "the eternal and indivisible capital of Israel" (p 210). In the wake of this the Israeli Knesset passed on 14 December 1981 a law extending Israeli jurisdiction to Syrian territory--the Golan Heights--which meant actual annexation of this Arab territory, which was occupied in 1967, also.

A direct offspring of the Camp David agreements also was the longest and cruelest military campaign which Israel has unleashed against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples on Lebanese territory. It is not fortuitous that the names of Shabra and Shatila are involuntarily associated with Camp David. "The tragedy of Lebanon," the scholar sums up, "...has entered the history of mankind as a black page. And the Camp David conspiracy led to this tragedy" (p 311).

The American concept of "peace" which the United States is stubbornly attempting to foist on the peoples of the Near East has led to new dramatic events in the region and a further exacerbation of the situation here. At the same time the fate of the Lebanese-Israeli agreement imposed by Washington showed the complete groundlessness of the latter's Near East policy. This is the book's main conclusion.

The monograph is packed with a wealth of material--memoirs, official documents and extensive research. But the author's personal impression gleaned from meetings with those about whom he writes and whose actions he analyzes lend it a particular freshness which enlivens many pages.

Ye. Primakov does not confine himself to an examination merely of the Camp David process directly and the questions directly connected with it. Such problems as the "Israeli nuclear option" (pp 105-121), "Islamic fundamentalism" (pp 247-251), the Iran-Iraq conflict (p 252) and a number of others also represent subjects of study. The analysis thereof undoubtedly enriches the work.

Strictly speaking, the monograph has in retrospect been written according to the "classical" model of yesterday, today, tomorrow. However, when one encounters the arguments concerning the disagreements within the PLO and the prospects and various "models" of a Near East settlement (pp 307-309) from the standpoint of a person who has familiarized himself with the Jordan-Palestinian agreement of 11 February 1985 and the reaction thereto of various Palestinian organizations and Arab countries, one understands that the author has correctly divined the most probable trends of the development of the Near East situation.

The Soviet reader has acquired an interesting and discursive book which will rightly occupy a place among the best works on the most recent history of the Near East.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

SWISS-HUNGARIAN BOOK ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 137-139

[A. Kireyev review: "Material Basis of Peaceful Coexistence"]

[Text] The serious complication of the international situation and the attempts of the forces of imperialist reaction to revive the spirit of the cold war have set the scientific community and all sober-minded people in the world the problem of the search for a kind of "common denominator" capable of being the dependable basis of a policy of the peaceful coexistence of states with different socioeconomic systems. It is not fortuitous, therefore, that an increasingly large amount of research has appeared in foreign literature in recent years analyzing the theoretical aspects of the coexistence and interaction of the socialist and capitalist countries in the most diverse spheres.

One such interesting and timely work is the book in question "East-West Relations in the Mid-Eighties: in Search of a New Equilibrium,"* which was published in Budapest by the Hungarian Scientific Council for World Economy. It represents a collection of material of the latest, third, "roundtable" of international affairs scholars of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Swiss Higher International Studies Institute. Not confining themselves to questions of bilateral Hungarian-Swiss relations, the authors examine a broader set of problems of East-West relations, predominantly in the trade-economic sphere.

Analyzing the business relations of the socialist and industrially developed capitalist countries from the standpoints of world economic development, G. Godard, professor at Lausanne University, believes that such phenomena as crisis processes, the new stage of the scientific-technical revolution and the emergence of so-called "new industrial countries" are reflected in the economic relations of the states of the two systems of the world economy. For this reason the international conditions of the states' economic cooperation and contact are determined and conditioned to an increasingly great extent primarily by their objective requirements.

* "East-West Relations in the Mid-Eighties: in Search of a New Equilibrium. Hungarian and Swiss Analyses," ed. by I. Dobozi, N. Matejka, Budapest, Hungarian Scientific Council for World Economy, 1984, p 196.

One such requirement in the atmosphere of the deepening instability of the capitalist economy is trade relations with the socialist countries. In confirmation of his thought the author quotes a pronouncement of V. Giscard d'Estaing: "When between two countries there are only diplomatic relations, the drama is always concealed behind doors because the success of one country could signify only the failure of the other. The strength of commercial relations is that there can be no winners or losers in them. The economic miracle operates, and the deal is of mutual benefit thanks to the multiplication effect of trade" (p 20).

Emphasizing that the present tense international situation is creating difficulties in the way of the development of trade, G. Godard rightly believes that to remove them steps should be taken primarily to improve political relations. In the institutional sphere, he believes, efforts should be channeled into an improvement of the activity of the existing bilateral and multilateral international economic organizations, in which the interests of both the socialist and the capitalist countries are represented. Much could be done directly in the sphere of economic relations by the capitalist states themselves by way of the removal of the discriminatory barriers in the way of commodities from the socialist countries. "The Western states," the professor believes, "are capable of contributing to the development of commodity exchange with the East, just as with the rest of the world" (p 23).

The Hungarian authors of the book in question regard East-West trade as an integral component of the worldwide economy. A (Miklovich), director of the Hungarian International Economic Relations Secretariat, notes that both East and West have an equal interest in the solution of the present-day global problems confronting all countries. They are particularly pressing for Europe, where opposite sociopolitical systems "abut" one another directly.

Thus for the small states at the center of the European continent the problem of environmental pollution has become particularly serious in our day. In Hungary, for example, only 4 percent of surface water resources are fed from sources on the territory of the country. The remaining 96 percent of water comes from abroad already polluted by enterprises of other countries (p 30).

M. (Simay), deputy director of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy, analyzes East-West trade-economic relations from the viewpoint of the development of the contradictions of the three centers of interimperialist rivalry. He observes that the degree of capitalist states' interest in business relations with the socialist countries largely depends on the level of the latter's provision with fuel-raw material resources. While the United States is 16 percent dependent on foreign sources of the supply of such commodities, this indicator is considerably higher for the EEC and Japan, constituting 75 and 90 percent respectively (p 78). Whence the objective possibility of a nonconcurrence of the interests of the United States, the EEC countries and Japan in the sphere of trade with the socialist countries.

However, the author believes, it would be an oversimplification to exaggerate the seriousness of the conflicts arising among the "power centers" of capitalism, primarily between the United States and West Europe. He believes it essential

to consider that, first, relations between them are developing under the conditions of the identical nature or proximity of their long-term strategic interests, which is exerting a limiting influence on interimperialist contradictions. Second, these contradictions themselves as the cause of conflicts are not directly connected with East-West relations. And, finally, the clashes which come about often reflect general difficulties of the world economy which to a certain extent could influence the socialist countries' interests also (pp 82-83).

Analyzing the history of East-West trade relations, another Hungarian participant in the collective monograph, (Yu. Beren'i), scientific associate of the Institute of World Economy, attempted a periodization of it. She distinguishes several periods. The formation of the world socialist system opened the "restoration of trade" stage, which lasted until the end of the 1950's. At this time the sides' efforts were aimed at a resumption of traditional commercial contacts. As a result of the development of all-European trade cooperation the capitalist countries' share of the socialist states' foreign economic turnover increased considerably.

In the 1960's, at the new stage, which the author calls "concentration of resources," there was a gradual closer adaptation of the partners to one another, an improvement in the commodity structure and an expansion of the geography of reciprocal exchange. At the start of the 1970's, at the "change of eras" stage, which was characterized by an easing of the political climate in East-West relations, trade relations acquired additional impetus for development, which led to a considerable increase in commodity turnover. The current stage of trade, which is occurring under the conditions of a complication of the international situation, has been marked by appreciable changes in the structure of the reciprocal exchange of the socialist and industrially developed capitalist countries.

The book also makes a detailed study of such important questions of East-West business relations as cooperation in the sphere of power engineering, technology exchange, trade on a compensatory basis, payment-credit relations, cultural relations and so forth. The articles of both the Hungarian and Swiss specialists are imbued with concern for the preservation of peace and they propose specific steps to improve the international situation.

It has to be said that certain propositions of the economists from Switzerland give rise to objections. Thus G. Godard, for example, believes that global problems, of which he mentions only poverty and hunger, are the main threat to peace in the world (p 24). It is obvious, however, that the main problem of modern civilization is that of preserving peace. Whether mankind will altogether have a chance to work on solving other global problems depends on its solution.

Nor can we agree with the conclusion of J.-C. (Lambele), director of the Swiss Center for Applied Economic Research, concerning the lack of prospects of return trade, in which he includes, inter alia, deals on a compensatory basis (p 127). As practice attests, compensatory cooperation, which has been developed rapidly in the past decade, has proven its viability even under the international conditions of the first half of the 1980's.

Nonetheless, and this is very significant, the differences in views are surmountable on condition that the sides be prepared to conduct an honest and open dialogue on the urgent problems. The latest "roundtable" meeting of scholars of Hungary and Switzerland was such a dialogue, we believe. The book in question is a useful theoretical and practical contribution to the important business of seeking ways of strengthening the material basis of a policy of peaceful coexistence, the achievement of East-West understanding and of ensuring a victory for reason in international relations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

U.S. ANTHOLOGY ON EUROMISSILES CONTROVERSY REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 139-140

[V. Valentinov review: "Belated Debate"]

[Text] The book in question, "Nuclear Weapons in Europe,"* which was published under the aegis of the Council on Foreign Relations (New York), which is influential in the United States, is devoted to the keen debate on the deployment of the new American intermediate-range nuclear missiles. Its authors include such politicians and experts as K. Voigt, prominent figure of the SPD, P. Warnke, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, W. Hyland, former presidential national security adviser, and L. Friedman, professor at Kings College, University of London.

The editor of the book is A. Pierre, senior scientific associate of the Council on Foreign Relations and the author of a number of well-known books illustrating problems of nuclear weapons. He writes that the debate which has gripped the United States and West Europe concerning nuclear weapons raises fundamental questions of the future of American-West European relations and, among these, the central question of "will West Europe's security depend indefinitely on the United States and, if so, to what extent and in what form" (p 2). It is emphasized in the preface that following the start of deployment of the new American intermediate-range missiles the arguments surrounding the problems connected with the United States' "nuclear presence" not only have not abated but, on the contrary, have become even more heated. "Most likely, these questions," A. Pierre believes, "will be debated far more extensively in the next few years on both sides of the Atlantic by the new generation, which has encountered them only quite recently and which, as is obvious, is not prepared to automatically accept the Atlantic orthodoxy characteristic of the postwar generation" (p 3).

The essence of the missile debate between the United States and West Europe is assessed variously in the book. W. Hyland believes that behind the question of how many American nuclear missiles should be deployed on the European continent stands "the continuing struggle over the future of Europe--will West Europe build its security through close relations with the United States or will it gradually occupy a more autonomous position" (p 15). Distorting the policy of the USSR and the other socialist countries aimed at a

* "Nuclear Weapons in Europe," ed. by Andrew Pierre, Council on Foreign Relations, Inc., New York, 1984 pp X plus 118.

relaxation of tension and all-European cooperation, this author asserts that "the Soviet Union hopes to separate the United States from Europe and the FEG from the West" (p 29). It is not surprising that he regards the American missiles primarily as a basic means for strengthening NATO and levers with which the United States will be able to compel the West European allies to abide by a pro-Atlantic and pro-American policy. Largely for these same considerations L. Friedman recommends the continuation and strengthening of the U.S. nuclear contribution to the so-called "defense" of Europe.

K. Voigt believes that the problem of the nuclear weapons on the continent should be examined from a different reference point: do the American missiles increase European security or not. "Everyone who, like the Germans, lives along the border dividing the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Pact is keenly aware that even a war waged with conventional arms leaves few chances for survival. This is true to an even greater extent in respect of a war using nuclear weapons, even 'only' so-called tactical weapons, thousands of which have been deployed in Europe. Their use on the battlefield would turn a large part of the continent into a wilderness" (p 98). Taking this conclusion as a basis, the West German specialist calls for emphasis to be put on a reduction in the nuclear component in NATO's military plans and for a switch from the dangerous strategy of nuclear restraint to a policy of East-West cooperation on security issues. "Preventing war through deterrence," he rightly concludes, "is an ambiguous and paradoxical concept. It is attended by such risk as makes it incapable of ensuring a lengthy preservation of peace. In particular, democratic societies cannot indefinitely consider legitimate the possibility of the annihilation of mankind as a prior condition of the preservation of peace" (p 117).

P. Warnke shares K. Voigt's viewpoint that the deployment of the American missiles not only has not strengthened the security of the West European allies but, on the contrary, has weakened it, having increased the threat of nuclear war. The North Atlantic bloc's existing military plans for using nuclear weapons are simply suicidal. "Under practically no conceivable circumstances could NATO's use of nuclear weapons contribute to successful defense" (p 75).

The keen debate on the intermediate-range missiles has also raised questions concerning battlefield nuclear weapons. As is known, thousands of the United States' tactical nuclear warheads, which could in the event of use on the battlefield detonate a global nuclear war, have been deployed in West Europe. All the authors of the book agree that the number of these weapons should be considerably reduced. K. Voigt believes that to reduce the risk of the outbreak of a conflict it is essential to create in the center of Europe a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons, which "would be capable of reducing the military significance of theater nuclear weapons. It could halt the trend toward the development of small nuclear warheads and thereby contribute indirectly to the conclusion of a treaty on the complete banning of nuclear weapons. In addition, this proposal would reduce the danger of nuclear war in Central Europe" (p 115).

P. Warnke warns that the use of tactical nuclear weapons on the battlefield would immediately entail retribution, and, consequently, any "limited" nuclear conflict would grow into a global conflict. He emphasizes the danger of U.S. and NATO doctrine which contemplates first use of nuclear weapons (p 86).

This sound viewpoint is opposed by L. Friedman, who believes that NATO should not assume the commitment on no first use of nuclear weapons. This commitment, he categorically declares, is "totally unrealistic" (p 68). He is echoed by W. Hyland. Sharply rejecting the proposal for a reexamination of the military doctrine of flexible response, which provides for first use of nuclear weapons, and fearing the disintegration of NATO, he writes that this doctrine "cannot be replaced either by a doctrine of restraint with the aid of conventional arms or a doctrine of no first use of nuclear weapons without the risk of the long-term neutralization of West Europe." The latter, he threatens, "would inevitably have to seek assurances concerning its security in the East" if it cuts itself off from American nuclear forces (p 43).

The majority of the book's authors, even those urging the continued presence of American missiles in Europe, is forced to acknowledge the existence of profound disagreements between the United States and the West European countries on arms control issues. "The division between Europe and the United States," the same W. Hyland admits, "on arms control problems has become extremely serious" (p 25). All agree that the nuclear threat has awoken Europeans' self-awareness and forced them to adopt a more critical approach to an assessment of the "usefulness" of nuclear weapons as a "means of restraint". The work notes that "following the deployment of the American missiles in Europe, the aversion to nuclear weapons will most likely continue to develop and strengthen even" (p 41).

However, the authors disagree in their opinions concerning the way out of the deadlock situation caused by this deployment. P. Warnke and K. Voigt recommend that the United States and NATO increase attention not to a buildup of nuclear arms but to a considerable reduction therein and counsel that proposals be made which on the one hand would not provide for the deployment of American missiles and, on the other, would lead to a certain reduction in the USSR's nuclear missiles (pp 90, 105). Their opponents insist that the United States should continue to carry out NATO's "twin decision" on "rearmament and negotiations". W. Hyland and L. Friedman claim that abandonment of the deployment of the American missiles could be a "military and political catastrophe" for NATO (pp 39, 68-69). But even they in fact acknowledge the need for consideration of the British and French nuclear forces in the overall nuclear balance (pp 41, 72).

The book in question testifies to the broadening disagreements between the United States and its West European allies on questions of nuclear weapons, which are intensifying even more in the process of deployment of the new American missiles in West Europe.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

BOOK ON U.S., WEST EUROPEAN ARMS EXPORTS REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 143-144

[A. Portnyagin review: "Military Supplies--Threat to Peace"]

[Text] The monograph in question* studies an important problem of contemporary international relations--arms exports in the capitalist world. Its relevance is conditioned by the fact that under the conditions of the intensification of militarist trends in the foreign policy of the imperialist states, primarily the United States, the expansion of military supplies to various parts of the world creates a real threat to international peace and security not only today but in the future also.

An undoubted merit of the work is the multilevel aspect of examination of the subject. The author has made, we believe, a successful attempt to analyze a whole number of aspects in two problem aspects: the military exports of the United States and the West European countries as independent subjects on the world arms market and their competitive struggle for markets for the sale of the lethal goods in the developing countries.

Understanding the complexity of questions of arms exports, their insufficient degree of study and also the prospects of the emergence of new problems as a result of the pursuit of the expansionist policy of imperialism and the development of military equipment, the author confines his study to an examination of the political aspects of the subject. A vast amount of factual material drawn from American and West European sources is used here.

The book shows convincingly that arms sales occupy a principal place in the rivalry of the United States and West Europe, which began back in the 1960's, although its sharp intensification pertains to the last decade. Tracing the different stages of the inter-Atlantic competition in the sphere of arms production and sales, the author concludes that despite the gradual weakening back in the 1960's even of the positions of the United States as main arms producer, its military industry on the frontier of the 1980's also remained "three times as powerful as its West European counterpart" (p 36).

* A.I. Utkin, "SShA i Zapadnaya Yevropa: trgovlya oruzhiyem (Mezhdunarodno-politicheskiy aspekt)" [The United States and West Europe: the Arms Trade (International Policy Aspect)], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka," 1984, p 182.

The Pentagon's close ties to 20,000 major suppliers and 100,000 subcontractors and also the activity of the 1,500 firms and 2.5 million persons employed in the country's military production, which participate in arms exports directly, serve as the basis of this.

Undersecretary of State L. Benson, who was responsible for arms sales policy in the J. Carter administration, once had every right to confidently declare: "I have every reason to believe that in the foreseeable future we will remain the biggest arms exporter" (p 7).

Rightly pointing to the military establishment's endeavor to use overseas arms exports for the purpose of extorting the maximum profits (at the start of the 1980's American orders had risen to a volume of more than \$80 billion--5 times more than the sum total of orders for the preceding 20 years; in 1982 alone the United States sold arms totaling \$21.5 billion, while their Atlantic partner-competitors sold approximately only half as much), the author emphasizes attention to the big political benefit which the Pentagon intends to derive from military exports (p 5).

It is not a matter of indifference to the military-industrial complex who is predominant on the arms sales markets--the Pentagon, which relies on the power of the biggest American military monopolies--or West European capitalism, which is attempting on the one hand to resist the power of the United States in NATO and, on the other, to compete with it on the markets of the developing countries.

It is difficult not to agree with the author that in mutual relations with the young Asian, African and Latin American states the Western powers, partially persuaded of the groundlessness of former colonial methods, are making a big gamble on arms exports as an important and promising lever in the struggle for zones of influence. The fact that the basic flow of weapons made by the "Atlantic" allies is channeled into the young independent states testifies to this. Whereas prior to the mid-1960's West Europe, Canada, Japan and Australia purchased 80 percent of the arms sold by the Americans, by the boundary of the 1980's their share had fallen to 15 percent. In the period 1977-1980 the developing countries, on the other hand, accounted for approximately 70 percent of world exports of the lethal commodities (pp 102, 104).

A. Utkin reveals the intricate mechanism of the competition of the United States and West Europe on the developing countries' arms markets, characteristic features of which are the linking of economic accords to military deals, supplementing arms sales agreements with economically tempting projects, ideological indoctrination of the command staff of the armies of the importer-countries and extensive use of the practice of political maneuvering.

The chapters containing an analysis of the policy of the J. Carter and R. Reagan administrations in the sphere in question, which broadens our idea of areas of the foreign policy course of both the Democrats and Republicans which are important, but which have as yet been illustrated insufficiently in the press, are interesting, we believe.

The author correctly notes that the head of the present administration--one of the most militarist in the entire postwar period--has rejected the proposition concerning the need for a "world without arms". "The ideology of anticommunism and the transfer of all world problems to the channel of East-West confrontation logically led the Republican leadership," the work emphasizes, "to remove even the former barriers in the way of American arms exports" (p 150). R. Reagan's inveterate anticommunism has engendered a "new" policy in the sphere of military exports based on complete satisfaction of the need of America's allies and the regimes dependent on U.S. imperialism for arms in any quantity they require.

The researcher's conclusion that the "saturation" of the world with arms, which is myopically regarded in the leading capitalist countries as a means of strengthening their own economy and spreading their foreign policy influence, contains in reality the prerequisites for negative economic shifts and future bitter conflicts threatening international peace is an urgent and justified warning to the West's militarist circles.

Despite all its merits, the book in question is not free of certain omissions, which do not detract from an overall positive evaluation of it. Thus the author rightly concludes that the creation of "powder kegs" in various parts of the world is fraught with the danger of the outbreak of bitter conflicts, and there are many examples of this. A more comprehensive analysis of how the competing battalions of Western countries on the world arms market are undermining regional stability and destroying the often fragile structure of interstate relations would have been appropriate here, however.

More attention should have been paid, in our view, to an examination of the dangerous consequences of the policy of the unswerving expansion of military exports by the Western states, primarily the United States, for the cause of peace and international security, which is particularly pertinent now.

The author's analysis of the ruinous impact of American-West European rivalry in the sphere of arms exports on the economic situation in many young independent states, which have been forced to divert colossal resources vitally necessary for the solution of the most acute socioeconomic problems, could have been a valuable, serious addition.

We would note in conclusion that the book in question, which contributes to the development of an important problem of world politics and economics, should attract the attention not only of international affairs specialists but of broad reading circles also.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

INSTITUTE BOOK ON THIRD WORLD SOCIOECONOMIC PROBLEMS REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 85 (signed to press 12 May 85) pp 144-146

[I. Aleshina review: "Interdisciplinary Analysis: Effectiveness and Difficulties"]

[Text] A comprehensive approach to study of the regularities of the development of the emergent countries has become the norm for Soviet scholars. This tradition is continued by the book in question also.* As of the 1950's the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Geography has been studying the new integral--spatial and sectorial--structures taking shape in the young national states.

The wealth of experience accumulated in the course of the analysis of individual aspects of development has enabled the group of authors to prepare a summary work whose publication opens a multilevel serial pertaining to a study of the general and the particular in the development of the emergent countries. The book contributes to a certain extent to an improvement in scientific methodology--it makes a successful, in our opinion, attempt to employ elements of interdisciplinary analysis making it possible to see the problem in greater depth and to forecast the future better.

In each instance of intersectorial social science study a specific set of disciplines is selected whose coupling is subordinated to its goals and tasks. The given monograph examines the interaction in the course of development on specific territories of natural, ecologico-resource and demographic factors and economic and socioeconomic components with regard for historical stratifications and modern dynamics. The latter are reflected in the complex conditions of the confrontation, competition and cooperation of national and external forces (pp 5, 8).

I believe that the group of authors has "stumbled upon the trail" of a possible effective method of the organization of interdisciplinary research, which requires of the scholar particularly high professionalism and intuition.

* Razvivayushchiyesya strany. Osnovnyye problemy ekonomicheskoy i sotsial'noy geografii" [The Developing Countries. Basic Problems of Economic and Social Geography], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Mysl'," 1983 p 292.

An "inventory" is gradually taken, as it were, from chapter to chapter in the book of the basic acute problems--at first from the angle of individual spheres of development and, accordingly, branches of knowledge. These include the natural-resource factor and environmental conservation: the geographical aspects of population and urbanization; transformation of traditional agriculture; industrial development and the unfolding of manufacturing industry; the formation of transport systems. Then this entire, let us provisionally call it sectorial, set is focused from the viewpoint of the formation of the new territorial-spatial structure of the economy and regional development. After this it is "viewed" once more through the prism of the decision-making process in the course of elaboration of national regional policy and territorial planning.

The basic initial postulate on which the authors construct the analysis of the ways of the formation of structures is that this process in the countries which are dependent on imperialist centers proceeds under conditions of imbalance and a lack of equilibrium. The reasons for this are the past connected with colonial enslavement and the present characterized by backwardness, dependence and the need to adopt the most complex decisions under the conditions of tight incorporation in the world capitalist economy and the insane arms race, inspired by imperialism, in an atmosphere of the rapidly unfolding scientific-technical revolution, aloof from which even the developing countries cannot remain. The surmounting of the disequilibrium in the process of the formation of spatial and sectorial structures is difficult for all lagging countries. For those which are moving along a capitalist path, however, most acute social, economic and ecological collisions arise which result in tremendous damage to the peoples and the natural habitat and frequently in deadlock for a balanced development strategy. The thought that at the present time no national programs for surmounting socioeconomic backwardness may be considered realistic without regard for the natural-resource factor permeates the book.

A distinctive singularity of the study--and this is manifested in almost all chapters--is the combination of deliberations of a fundamental order and applied analysis resulting in theoretical generalizations and specific recommendations. Seemingly fruitful for further study is the finding arrived at in the conclusion of the monograph that several territorial levels of joint subordination may be distinguished in the developing countries, including the world-economy level conditioned by the subordinate place which they occupy in the system of the international capitalist division of labor; the intrastate level determined by the existence in each country of one or several leading areas and centers; and, finally, the local levels represented by the least developed areas isolated and divorced from the domestic market which is taking shape. This "multilevel character of socioeconomic backwardness" is viewed by the authors not only in a theoretical key but also from the viewpoint of possible paths of the effective accomplishment of tasks aimed at a rise in the balanced nature of regional development. A quest is under way for sectorial strategies for a specific territory possessing the greatest "area-forming power". Their realization can be ensured only by the state--on the paths of the expansion and strengthening of the state sector and with the assistance of the state authorities concerned.

The monograph contains many well-founded practical recommendations. There is a timely reminder of the importance of the use of the tremendous amount of material of field studies of African, Asian and Latin American studies, methods and approaches to an evaluation of natural-resource factors and also the existing test models of thematic and comprehensive mapping. It is noted that in the interests of increased ecological stability the mixed cultivation of agricultural crops is of marked preference to the one-crop system. The interested reader will find in the book many examples of thoughtful analysis and useful recommendations, which cannot be ignored under the conditions of the growing economic and scientific-technical lagging of the developing countries. It should, however, be said that this lagging, uneven and differentiated, can hardly legitimately be explained by the "conservation of socioeconomic backwardness" (p 271). The policy of conservation no longer corresponds currently to the interests of neocolonialism.

The study is imbued with realism and a profound understanding of the specific features of the young independent states. It rightly draws attention to the big potential in the use of the historical experience of overcoming backwardness accumulated in the USSR and to the need for a strengthening of the developing countries' relations with the socialist world. The book is sharply polemical and contains a serious, solidly argued critical investigation of non-Marxist views. This is particularly topical and could be of considerable interest to readers in the emergent countries, where criticism of Western concepts of growth and their variations is becoming increasingly widespread currently.

The success of the scholars of the Institute of Geography in the sphere of mastery of the methodology of interdisciplinary analysis are indisputable. And it is this which gives rise to the need for scientific dialogue between specialists of different profiles studying development problems. I believe it is important for subsequent works of the serial. The monograph in question employs as a general theoretical basis the "stable multistrukture" concept, which is now manifestly inadequate for an interpretation of the political economy essence of development processes in Asian, African and Latin American countries. As recent studies have shown, it does not correspond to the modern requirements of analysis both in the theoretical-methodological respect and from the viewpoint of objective reality--the degree of formational maturity of the unfolding socioeconomic processes is already quite high in many cases. The capitalist production mode has taken shape and a capitalist formation with its characteristic general regularities has matured in a number of young states. At the same time, on the other hand, the specific features of formational development and the distinctiveness of a socio-historical type of society in which its own characteristic socio-genetic "code" has evolved are preserved in them. They also continue to occupy a special place in the system of societies of an antagonistic type which Marx called the "secondary formation,"* which is influencing both the nature and genesis and development of the emerging spatial and sectorial structures. This conclusion is important for ascertaining the singularities of the operation of the laws of capitalism, which are weighing down the structural imbalance at all levels and in all spheres of the social progress of this group of countries.

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 19, p 403.

And one further consideration. It would seem that in the future it will be necessary to conduct the analysis with regard for the far-advanced differentiation of the countries and the typology of their dimensionality and spatial singularities inherited from the colonial past.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/15

End